DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 588 RC 018 536

AUTHOR	Cahape, Patricia, Ed.; Howley, Craig B., Ed.
TITLE	Indian Nations At Risk: Listening to the People. Summaries of Papers Commissioned by the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force of the U.S. Department of Education.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-880785-04-8
PUB DATE	Jan 92
CONTRACT	RI88062016
NOTE	130p.; For Final Report of the Task Force, see RC 018 443.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Alaska Natives; *American Indian Education; American Indians; *Curriculum Development; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Needs; *Educational Strategies; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Indian Relationship; Higher Education; *High Risk Students
IDENTIFIERS	Culturally Relevant Curriculum; *Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

ABSTRACT

This volume contains summaries of 20 papers commissioned by the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force. Based on research, testimony, and written materials submitted to the Task Force by hundreds of educational practitioners and concerned citizens, the papers provide in-depth analyses of current conditions in Native education and set forth rationale, plans, and strategies for the improvement of American Indian and Alaska Native education. The focus is on action to ensure high quality academic programs that are delivered in a Native cultural context. The topics of the 20 papers are: current conditions in American Indian and Alaska Native communities; current demographics and trends in Native American education; responsibilities and roles of governments and Native people in Native education; funding and resources; Native and non-Native teachers and administrators for schools serving Native students; continuous evaluation of Native education programs; early childhood education in Native communities; plans for dropout prevention and special school support services; improving parent participation; incorporating Native languages and culture into the curriculum; strategic plans for use of modern technologies in Native education; curricula for reading and language arts, mathematics and science, and history and social studies; gifted and talented Native students; Native Americans with disabilities; Native higher education; tribal colleges; adult literacy and vocational and technical education; and a concluding prospectus on change and development for Native education. This volume contains information about the authors and the work of the task force, and instructions for obtaining the full-length papers. (SV)

Edited by Patricia Cahape and Craig B. Howley

ED339588

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Indian Nations At Risk

Listening to the People

RC 018536

Summaries of Papers Commissioned by the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force of the U.S. Department of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indian Nations at Risk: Listening to the People

SUMMARIES OF PAPERS COMMISSIONED BY THE INDIAN NATIONS AT RISK TASK FORCE OF THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Edited by
Patricia Cahape and Craig B. Howley

Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools

Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325

Published January 1992.
Printed in the United States of America
Noncommercial reproduction of portions of this document is permitted provided the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools is credited as the source.

ISBN 1-880785-04-8

This publication was prepared with funding from the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, under contract no. RI-88-062016. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement or the Department of Education.

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword
by G. Mike Charleston and Gaye Leia King vii

Preface xiii

Summaries of Commissioned Papers

1. Current Conditions in American Indian and Alaska Native Communities
by Margaret Connell Szasz 1

2. Native American Education at a Turning Point: Current Demographics and Trends
by Walter Hillabrant, Mike Romano, and David Stang 6

3. Responsibilities and Roles of Governments and Native People in the Education of American Indians and Alaska Natives
by Kirke Kickingbird and G. Mike Charleston 10

4. Funding and Resources for American Indian and Alaska Native Education
by William Brescia 17

5. Native and Non-Native Teachers and Administrators for Elementary and Secondary Schools Serving American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Grayson Noley 23

6. Continuous Evaluation of Native Education Programs for American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Richard Nichols 28

7. Early Childhood Education in American Indian and Alaska Native Communities
by Alice S. Paul 39

8. Plans for Dropout Prevention and Special School Support Services for American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Jon Reyhner 42

9. Improving Parental Participation in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Robin A. Butterfield and Floy Pepper 47

10. Teaching Through Traditions: Incorporating Native Languages and Cultures into Curricula
by Linda Skinner 54

11. Strategic Plans for Use of Modern Technology in the Education of American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Paul K. Berg and Jason Ohler 60

12. Reading and Language Arts Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indians and Alaska Natives
by Gerald L. ("Jerry") Brown 66

13. Mathematics and Science Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Vera Preston 71

14. History and Social Studies Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Schools
by Karen Harvey 75

15. Gifted and Talented American Indian and Alaska Native Students
by Stuart Tonemah 81

16. American Indians and Alaska Natives with Disabilities
by Marilyn J. Johnson 86

17. American Indian and Alaska Native Higher Education: Toward a New Century of Academic Achievement and Cultural Integrity
by Bobby Wright 93

18. Tribal Colleges: Underfunded Miracles
by Schuyler Houser 97

19. Adult Literacy, Adult Education, and Vocational-Technical Education for American Indians and Alaska Natives
by John Hatch 102

20. A Concluding Prospectus on Change and Development for Native Education
by David Beaulieu 107

About the Authors of the Commissioned Papers 109

How to Obtain Indian Nations At Risk Publications 114

Foreword

This volume is not another study about the plight of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The commissioned papers—and the summaries drawn from them contained in this volume—are about *solutions* to the problems facing Native education and, in fact, all American education. The 20 commissioned papers review current Native education and set forth rationale, plans, and strategies for the improvement of American Indian and Alaska Native education.

The commissioned papers are the primary product of the work of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force. They are intended to serve specific needs of the Task Force and the broader needs of Native students, educators, legislators, and administrators involved in the education of Native people. The papers provided the Task Force with in-depth analyses of current conditions. The authors incorporated the knowledge and wisdom of hundreds of Native and non-Native practitioners and concerned people who presented testimony at the Task Force hearings, and others who submitted written papers to the Task Force. The focus is on *action* to ensure high-quality academic programs, rich in content, that are delivered in a Native cultural context. The Native educational context must be one in which Native culture and language and the role and status of tribal society are paramount.

The summaries contained in this volume have captured the highlights of the full-length papers in a shorter, more accessible form that we hope will be widely read and shared. We urge readers who have an interest in a specific area of American Indian or Alaska Native education to obtain the full-length commissioned papers. Information about how to order both the papers and the final report of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force is found in the last chapter of this volume.

A description of the process used by the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force in the development of the commissioned papers follows.

The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force

In order to determine solutions to the problems faced by American Indians and Alaska Natives in reaching their fullest potential, Educa-

tion Secretary Lauro F. Cavazos established the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force on March 8, 1990. Secretary Cavazos charged the Task Force with making practical recommendations for action to be taken by all those having a vital interest in the education of American Indians and Alaska Natives. Groups to be informed included educators, boards of education, public officials, state and local governments, the federal government, tribes, parents, students, and others.

The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force was co-chaired by: **William Demmert, Jr.** (Tlingit/Sioux), visiting professor of education at Stanford University and former Alaska commissioner of education; and **Terrel H. Bell**, noted lecturer and former United States secretary of education. The other Task Force members were:

- **David L. Beaulieu** (Minnesota Chippewa), Minnesota Department of Education's Indian education manager;
- **Joseph H. Ely** (Paiute), Stetson Engineering, Inc., and past Pyramid Lake Paiute tribal chair;
- **Byron F. Fullerton**, attorney and former dean at Texas Tech School of Law;
- **Norbert S. Hill, Jr.** (Oneida), executive director for the American Indian Science and Engineering Society;
- **Hayes A. Lewis** (Zuni), superintendent for the Zuni Public School District;
- **Bob G. Martin** (Cherokee), president of Haskell Indian Junior College;
- **Janine Pease-Windy Boy** (Crow), president of Little Big Horn College;
- **Wilma Robinson** (Creek), director of tribal development for the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma;
- **Ivan L. Sidney** (Hopi), assistant to the executive vice president of Northern Arizona University and former Hopi tribal chair;

- **Robert J. Swan** (Chippewa-Cree), federal projects coordinator for Rocky Boy Schools and past president of the National Indian Education Association;

- **Eddie L. Tullis** (Creek), tribal chair of the Poarch Band of Creek Indians and chair of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education; and

- **L. Lamar White** (Creek), program director for instructional technology, Florida Department of Education Technology Center.

The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force Meetings

The Task Force held meetings at the following places and times:

- Washington, D.C., in May 1990;

- Juneau, Alaska, in July 1990;

- San Diego, California, in October 1990;

- Palo Alto, California, in February 1991; and

- Washington, D.C., in June 1991.

The meetings were announced in the *Federal Register* and were open to the public.

The Task Force published its final report, titled *Indian Nations At Risk: An Educational Strategy for Action*, in October 1991. At that time, staff began disseminating 10,000 copies of the final report to Native educators and parents, and to a broad audience of congressional representatives, state officials, federal agencies, national education associations, and private foundations. The commissioned papers were distributed to Native tribes and organizations, college and university libraries, and other key information clearinghouses, including the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

Contributions of the Public

The Task Force established several methods for obtaining contributions of information, opinion, materials, and testimony from the public. The Task force announced a call for papers. It also conducted

public meetings, regional hearings, special issues sessions at the National Indian Education Conference, and site visits by the Task Force staff.

Call for papers. The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force issued a notice that appeared in the *Federal Register* on July 20, 1990. The notice invited the public to mail newly prepared or existing relevant papers or written testimony on American Indian and Alaska Native education issues directly to the Task Force offices. The public submitted over 200 documents in response. Task Force staff reviewed and cataloged the documents and sent them on to the authors who were writing commissioned papers. The papers submitted by the public constituted a significant resource for use by the Task Force.

Regional hearings. The Task Force also announced regional hearings in the *Federal Register*. One or more Task Force members and staff conducted the hearings in the following in locations: Juneau, Alaska; Billings, Montana; Seattle, Washington; Phoenix, Arizona; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; St. Paul, Minnesota; and Cherokee, North Carolina. Hundreds of individuals attended, providing verbal and written testimony. Native and non-Native educators, administrators, government officials, parents, students, and scholars addressed the Task Force on a wide range of issues. Court reporters transcribed the hearings. Soon after each hearing, staff prepared detailed notes of the proceedings and made them available to all Task Force members, authors, and other interested parties.

National Indian Education Association Conference. The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, in conjunction with the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE) conducted 18 special issues sessions at the San Diego, California, National Indian Education Association (NIEA) Conference on October 15-16, 1990. Most of the sessions were repeated to allow more opportunity for the public and American Indian and Alaska Native educators to present comments in small groups on a variety of key issues.

Court reporters recorded the sessions for the public record and staff made transcripts available. The proceedings of each of the sessions were prepared, copied, and distributed to all Task Force members, authors, and interested parties. Over 550 individuals participated in the 18 issues sessions. These proceedings are also available through the ERIC system.

Site visits. Between regional hearing dates, the Task Force staff

conducted 33 site visits. These sites visits produced detailed information on effective practices, which was used in the development of the final report and the commissioned papers.

Staff conducted informal interviews with over 100 individuals representing parents, school board members, school superintendents, principals, teachers, counselors, students, tribal planners, tribal chairmen, Native spiritual leaders, tribal college presidents, and Native organization directors. They discussed key issues and problems, and possible ways of fostering excellence in schools serving American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Staff observed a variety of sites ranging from education and cultural centers to public, BIA-operated, and Native-controlled schools. They examined specific programs at each site including examples of:

- dropout prevention research,
- dropout prevention through student leadership and career education,
- alternative schools serving dropouts,
- drug and substance abuse prevention through teacher and student training,
- bilingual teacher training,
- Native language and culture,
- computer technology in teaching,
- gifted and talented teacher training,
- tribal economic development through education, and
- educational reform planning to increase academic achievement of Native students in 19 dependent rural schools.

Sites were located in a variety of areas across the United States, from the Quileute Tribal School at La Push, Washington, to Robeson County Schools of North Carolina. These sites depicted the diversity as well as the commonality within rural areas like northern Montana's

Fort Peck Community College and Poplar Public Schools, and sprawling urban areas like Minnesota's St. Paul/Minneapolis metropolis.

Commissioned Papers

The Planning and Evaluation Service, in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, contracted for a series of commissioned papers by experts in the field of American Indian and Alaska Native education.

The commissioned papers addressed topics selected by the Task Force that are holistically linked to one another. Each paper addressed a specific set of topics developed by the Task Force staff. To accurately portray the broadest possible array of Native perspectives within each of their topics, the authors used information gathered from public testimony at national and regional Task Force meetings and hearings, documents from the national call for papers, existing literature and reports on Native education, and other research relevant to their topics.

It is these commissioned papers that are summarized in this anthology.

G. Mike Charleston, project director
and
Gaye Leia King, deputy project director
Indian Nations at Risk Task Force
December 1991

Editors' Preface

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (ERIC/CRESS) is pleased to collaborate with the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force in presenting this anthology, which *summarizes* 20 papers commissioned by the Task Force. The full-length papers comprise a massive body of work, drafts of which total nearly 1,000 pages.

Considering the importance of this work to the education of American Indians and Alaska Natives—and to American education generally—we thought a shorter, more accessible version would serve interested parties well. The summaries provide key ideas and selected recommendations from the full-length papers.

Nonetheless, as editors, we recognize the hazards of summarizing the original papers. Those papers are a rich source of information about the history, current status, and recommended strategies for improving American Indian and Alaska Native education. Inevitably, some important points may have been left out of the summaries. Moreover, in the interest of readability, we decided to omit from the summaries the references that warrant statements and provide supporting detail for the full range of ideas and facts in the original papers.

For these reasons, we urge anyone with a critical or scholarly interest in the topics of these summaries to consult the original papers. The full-length papers, together with full bibliographic references, offer far more information than the summaries could possibly comprehend. See the final chapter of this anthology for information about how to obtain copies of the papers, as well as other documents produced by the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force.

We expect that this volume will be read by many people concerned with the education of American Indians and Alaska Natives. But we also hope that it will attract the attention of non-Natives, because the circumstances reported here bear on the choices that all educators and communities must make on behalf of coming generations. What should the curriculum be? How should it be made? How can schooling wisely reflect local cultures and modes of expression? How can technology best serve human needs and interests? What do we

want our futures to be? These are enduring questions, and answers to them are never final or truly universal.

We owe a large debt of thanks to the many people who helped in this project. Since March 1990, Bob Stonehill and Pat Coulter, both of Central ERIC, encouraged our collaboration with the Task Force. This collaboration included provision of custom searches of the ERIC database to the authors of these papers. Gary Huang, assistant director of ERIC/CRESS, contributed much to this effort.

W. Larry Belgarde (founding president of Turtle Mountain College), Pamelia Coe (ERIC/CRESS Indian education expert), and Gaye Leia King (of the Task Force staff) reviewed the drafts of these summaries and recommended changes that substantially improved this anthology. Thanks go to the writers of the summaries, whose names are noted at the end of each summary. Carolyn Reynolds and Dianna Simms helped with typing and correcting the drafts. Sara Stricker and Phyllis Stowers each proofread the entire manuscript, and Carolyn Luzader typeset it. The dedication of all these people made the timely publication of this anthology a feasible goal. Responsibility for errors of commission and omission, of course, rests with the editors.

Pat Cahape, publications coordinator
Craig Howley, codirector
ERIC/CRESS

SUMMARY OF PAPER 1.

Current Conditions in American Indian and Alaska Native Communities

Margaret Connell Szasz

The school experience of American Indian and Alaska Native children hinges on the context in which their schooling takes place. This context inciudes the health and well-being of their families, their communities, and their governments, and on the relationship between Native and non-Native people.

Five centuries after contact with the outside world, many Native children are in desperate straits because of the immense difficulties that hinder their families and communities. They will continue to be dropouts or "pushouts" until conditions within their communities improve and the non-Native world arrives at a better understanding of Native people. Action plans must help Native children and communities find self-esteem and realize their full potential. Such plans must address economic and health conditions, Indian cultural heritage, and relationships with the outside world.

Economic Conditions

The general public may think of Native people in one of two ways: as Native warriors living in the wild west of the 19th century or as impoverished Natives living on reservations in the 20th century. The reality of Native life, however, is much more complex.

The hundreds of Native communities incorporate tremendous diversity. This simple fact makes generalizations about Native peoples difficult. Often—especially within the reservations—Native peoples suffer from the highest unemployment rates and conditions of greatest poverty in the United States. Average family incomes may be as low as $900 per year, and unemployment rates can run as high

as 90 percent. Many Native children in these communities develop a negative image of themselves and their societies—a view that is directly attached to their economic status.

With no jobs available, these Natives must, once they complete their schooling, leave home to find work. At the same time, Native peoples everywhere struggle with the challenges of supporting their families while making drastic changes in their cultural lives. Native communities must develop technical training programs that will enable their people to earn a living and serve as positive role models in the rural surroundings common to the reservations on which they live.

Some such programs have already begun to succeed in providing both self-confidence and jobs. Increased funding for the tribally controlled community colleges would encourage similar programs, such as the Lummi Tribe's program with its economic base in aquaculture.

A variety of efforts is possible. Native students receiving scholarship funds have a social obligation to give something in return. Under this plan, graduating students would devote part of their subsequent careers to service in their home communities. Also, urban universities should reach agreements with Native governments or economic development groups. Northern Arizona University, South Dakota State University, and the University of Minnesota have, for example, already negotiated such agreements. Likewise, city, state, and federal governments should expand previous agreements and develop new ones.

Together, these efforts could produce economic development plans similar to the Seventh Generation Fund, a Native-run foundation based in California, which promotes the growth of small businesses on reservations. The issue of establishing businesses on reservations has, however, created some antagonisms and divisions. Such proposals as leasing natural resources, creating manufacturing jobs, introducing bingo, and making reservations into waste-storage sites all have proponents in favor of the jobs and income these enterprises provide. On the other hand, opponents express concern for the loss of traditional values and environmental degradation that often accompany these activities. Native control of businesses is also at issue.

Urban Natives face similar conflicts between retaining cultural values and making a living. They know that higher education is important for higher wages, but they struggle for funds to provide

Adult Basic Education and other training programs. Minneapolis and Seattle are home to extraordinarily active communities. There, Native Americans work as paid and volunteer instructors to help their people join the ranks of the employed. But, maintaining funding for urban centers and programs is a chronic problem.

Health Conditions

In many Native communities, children and youth make up about half the total population. This circumstance is the result of a birth rate that was, during the 1980s, 79 percent higher than that of the general population.

The health needs of Native students are great. Success in school depends on good health, but the access of Native peoples to good health service is poor. Both economic and psychological barriers play a part in limiting access. Joblessness, poverty, drug abuse, and child abuse create a vicious cycle of destruction, with children its main victims. Depression is common, and suicide is now the second leading cause of death among Native adolescents. Fetal alcohol syndrome is so prevalent that its effects resemble those of the smallpox epidemics that, in the past, killed as many as 80 percent of Native populations.

Again, the need for the Native cultures to recover positive self-images has been widely recognized. In addition, many Natives are embracing a return to old spiritual values, a process that entails forsaking the use of alcohol and other drugs. Rural and reservation communities have established projects that involve Elders, teach traditional ways, and rely on the ancient strengths of Native peoples.

Urban Native communities should incorporate traditional concepts of healing into secular medical practices. Urban Natives and the Indian Health Service (IHS) should encourage urban universities with medical schools to broaden their curricula to include Native concepts of healing. The IHS alone cannot meet the needs of Native peoples. Despite rising health care costs and an expanding Native population, the IHS budget has remained constant at $1 billion per year for the last ten years. The federal government must provide more funding for the IHS and ask for greater accountability from the IHS, which directs only one percent of its limited budget to urban Natives, who comprise 50 percent of the Native population.

To cope, some urban Natives have founded youth centers and shelters like the one operating in St. Paul, Minnesota. Native self-help programs, as exemplified by the Zuni Wellness Center, must also

become more available. Indian communities need to be encouraged to continue to reach within to find resources despite challenges of limited funds.

Cultural Heritage

Generations of Native children have attended schools that discredited their beliefs and values. This treatment damages Native children's self-esteem and motivation to learn the academic canon of the larger society.

Native communities are now creating learning situations that combine traditional tools with modern tools, the drum with the computer. From elementary schools to the tribally controlled community colleges, Native youth are reaffirming the validity of their cultures. They are learning that being Indian and being successful are not mutually exclusive.

This process begins with the training of non-Native teachers. Alaska Natives now provide language and cultural training to teachers. Native communities elsewhere are following that lead. The emphasis is on recruiting Native teachers who will remain committed to their languages and homeplaces when non-Natives move away. Unfortunately, during the 1980s there was no funding for Native teacher-training programs, contributing to a drastic shortage of Native teachers.

Native governments, universities, and the federal government can provide incentives, programs, and funding to train teachers. In addition, states need to remove the legal stumbling blocks that prevent Native schools from employing valued community members. Changes in teacher certification requirements will be necessary.

Curriculum revision and increased parent participation are needed. The latter presents a special challenge, as the parents of today's students were taught in schools dominated by non-Natives. These parents still have difficulty overcoming the condescension of educators toward Natives.

Creative public school programs in Minnesota and in Buffalo, New York, are working to strengthen Native cultural heritage. There, urban magnet schools offer an environment supportive of Native students. Native Americans hope that such efforts will reduce the dropout rate, which can, in part, be attributed to non-Native ignorance of Native culture. Presently, schools either ignore Native culture and history or provide information that is inaccurate and demeaning. Teachers and

educators need to learn about Native cultures, so that they can provide culturally sensitive learning to Native youth.

Relationship With The Outside World

Too often, there is a gap between Native communities and the schools that Native students attend. This gap compounds the one that already separates Natives and the outside world. School systems in rural and reservation areas must include Native families in their activities in ways that help Native children understand that school is an *extension* of their cultural bonds. Historically, the Elders have been the teachers of Native children; they should be accorded that position in present-day classrooms.

Native governments are also rethinking their roles in educational policymaking. Tribal groups need to become active partners in making education a priority, mandating the inclusion of Native language and culture in school curricula. They need to pass resolutions supporting scholarship funds, summer work projects, and incentives to bring students back to their tribes after graduation. Finally, Native governments must foster cooperation between the tribal, state, and federal governments. These bodies must be informed about the needs of Native community schooling, and they must be encouraged to include Natives in policy decisions.

Conclusions

It is time to "Indianize" Indian programs. Tribal leaders must work with their governments and their people to establish Native control of educational and social programs. State and federal governments must not be allowed to escape their responsibilities. Universities, businesses, and foundations must take action for change. And the non-Native public—influenced by the media—must learn the facts about living conditions among American Indians and Alaska Natives. Native children are at risk now, and a concerted effort is required to ensure their continued survival.

—Summary by Nancy Balow

SUMMARY OF PAPER 2.

Native American Education at a Turning Point: Current Demographics and Trends

Walter Hillabrant, Mike Romano, David Stang, and Mike Charleston

Counting the numbers of American Indians and Alaska Natives is difficult. Often the count is affected by such factors as who collects the data, the method of data collection, and the perceived objectives of the data collection. The forecasts in this paper are often based on only a few years of data and small samples. The need for better quality data for Native populations cannot be overemphasized. Despite these limitations, it is important to make an attempt to describe current trends and to make projections.

The following demographics, statistics, and trends related to Native American education focus on the present situation and make projections for the year 2000. Two trends—a substantial increase in the number of school-age Natives and an increase in the average age of the Native population—should be taken into account in any plans for improving Native education.

Demographics of the Native Population

The numbers of American Indians and Alaska Natives are growing fast. Growth in urban areas is nearly double the rate of population growth in rural areas. Nonetheless, American Indians and Alaska Natives still comprise less than one percent of the total U. S. population. In addition, the low density of Indians in the population is an accelerating trend.

While there are more than 500 American Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages, ten groups of tribes account for more than half the Native population. Arizona contains all or part of six of the ten largest

reservations, with the states of South Dakota and New Mexico also containing more than one. California is expected to retain first place as the state having the largest number of American Indians living in urban areas.

Social and Economic Characteristics of Native Americans

The educational attainment of Natives is significantly lower than that of the total U. S. population. Fifty-six percent of American Indians and 46 percent of Alaska Natives over age 25 have completed four years of high school, compared with 67 percent of the total U. S. population.

In addition, Natives do not participate in the labor force to the same degree as the total population. The Native population is younger, with larger families, a lower per capita income, more persons below the poverty line, a lower proportion of high school graduates, and more unemployed persons than the total population. Natives generally die younger than other Americans. Efforts to improve Native education must overcome the effects of these high levels of unemployment, poverty, and health problems.

Enrollment Trends

In grades K-12, about 85 percent of Native students currently attend public schools, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and private schools still enrolling significant numbers of students. In contrast to the United States as a whole, the trend in Native education is toward an overall *increase* in the number of Native students enrolled in grades K-12.

In institutions of higher education, Native student enrollment has been increasing at a rate of about 1.2 percent per year, about the same increase as in higher education generally. The majority of Native students is enrolled in two-year colleges. Since 1968, 24 tribally controlled community colleges have been established, and their enrollment is projected to grow throughout the 1990s. Major fields of study are business and management, social science, and education. Computer science is very much underrepresented.

Overall enrollment of Native students in adult education programs is also growing. Participation in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of Indian Adult Education programs, however, is decreasing.

In vocational education and rehabilitation, the U. S. Department of

Education's Indian Vocational Education Program increased both total appropriations and number of projects funded. The Bureau of Indian Affairs' Adult Vocation Education Program and the Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Program (operated through the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the U. S. Department of Education) also provide vocational rehabilitative services.

The Native population has greater needs for special education professionals than other groups. Native students are significantly underrepresented in gifted and talented programs but overrepresented in programs for students with learning disabilities.

Standardized Measures of Scholastic Aptitude

On standardized tests such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American College Testing Program (ACT), Native students' scores are improving slightly. However, given the current trends, even by the year 2000, Native students will still lag substantially behind the forecasted scores for all students.

Dropout and Educational Attainment

Native students have the highest dropout rate of any racial or ethnic group, almost twice that of white students. In higher education, the number of master's degrees awarded to Native students has been increasing steadily. One trend is for increasing proportions of Native students to earn bachelor's, rather than associate, degrees by the year 2000.

Funding for Education

When inflation is taken into account, funding for Native education through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U. S. Department of Education has decreased since 1975. Most of the tribally controlled community colleges receive funding through the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978. But, on a per-pupil basis, this funding has been decreasing each year. Funding for adult education programs for Native populations is also on the decline. Private foundations, such as the Bush Foundation in St. Paul, Minnesota, have been helpful in funding certain educational institutions.

School Personnel

The training, recruitment, and retention of teachers, especially in minority schools, are major problems. The general trend has been a

slow increase in the number of Native teachers and faculty. But, the increase still brings the total to a level far short of the proportion of Native students.

Conclusion

We would like to believe that, by the year 2000, the Native student will attain a level equal to the general student population in terms of academic and social achievement. Analyses of current trends, however, suggest that—without massive and effective restructuring of Native education from preschool to professional schools—such attainment is not probable.

—Summary by Barbara Merrill

SUMMARY OF PAPER 3.

Responsibilities and Roles of Governments and Native People in the Education of American Indians and Alaska Natives

Kirke Kickingbird
and G. Mike Charleston

The contemporary relationship between the United States and the Native nations is usually described as government-to-government. The simple equality implied by such a description is the result of a complex legal and political relationship based on standards set over 500 years ago. This paper traces the development of the relationship between Native and European peoples, notes the importance of Native education to the effectiveness of the relationship, and recognizes the necessity for Native participation in the control of Native education.

Historical Basis

At the time of Columbus, the theologian and jurist Francisco de Vitoria advised the emperor of Spain that no change in ownership of land could take place without the consent of the Natives. He thus declared the Doctrine of Discovery inapplicable (as the lands were already owned by the Natives) and established four principles by which the effectiveness of Native legal rights can still be measured:

- political equality of the races,
- tribal self-government,
- central government control of Native affairs, and
- governmental protection of Native rights.

After two centuries of European competition for control of North America, Britain superseded France and Spain in what is now the United States and confirmed Britain's policy of acquiring Native land by purchase.

Constitutional and Legal Basis of the Trust and Fiduciary Relationship of the United States and Native Governments

"Conquest" is the popular notion about how Native lands were acquired after the American Revolution. But military conquest was not, for practical purposes, the primary means of such acquisition. Instead, land was purchased. The Commerce Clause and Treaty-Making Clause of the U. S. Constitution, along with two early Supreme Court cases, form the legal basis for the guardian-ward relationship between the U. S. and Native governments. Theoretically, Native governments relinquish external sovereignty to the United States, but retain complete internal sovereignty.

Legally speaking, the fact that Europeans and the United States entered into treaties with Native governments shows that they recognized Native sovereignty. The United States was *negotiating* for powers once held exclusively by the Native governments. Early treaties usually dealt with military, political, or economic alliances. These treaties primarily involved a cession of Native land. As such action restricted Natives to small land areas, it became the policy of the United States to "civilize and Christianize" Native peoples so that they could be made over as farmers. The Civilization Fund Act of 1819—until it was repealed in 1873—provided for such actions through federal control of Native education. Some tribes were civilized nearly to extinction, and the congressional "termination" acts of the 1950s and 1960s relieved the United States of responsibility to these tribes. These acts, however, did not abrogate the Native treaty rights to use of their sovereign lands.

Federal Control of Native Education and the End of Treaty-Making

A rapidly growing white population throughout the 19th century pressured the United States to search for more successful and more rapid means to assimilate Natives than the Christian missionary schools. The federal government established militaristic vocational

schools for Indians in the latter half of the 19th century. This strategy also failed.

Actively at war with many tribes and disgruntled at constitutional exclusion of the House of Representatives in the treaty-making process, the Congress in 1871 ended treaty-making with Native governments, essentially legalizing the assimilation of Native peoples and the annexation of their lands. In place of treaties, the United States offered "agreements," which the Supreme Court recognized as equivalent to the earlier treaties. While little practical effect was realized, this action clouded the status of Native nations. It legitimized refusals to recognize them as sovereign nations. The relevant Act is still in effect today.

While the U. S. government continued to recognize the existence of Native governments in court, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) proceeded to operate as though they had been terminated. The BIA controlled all aspects of Native education and government. Likewise, state governments entered into political rivalry with Native governments for coveted lands and resources. Conflicts over both civil and criminal authority between state and Native governments continue to this day. Authority and responsibility for education has been a constant source of conflict between tribes, states, and the federal government.

Twentieth Century and the New Deal

In 1928 the Institute for Government Research released the Meriam Report criticizing the federal government on the administration and education of Natives. The report essentially called for a changed view of Native peoples. It advocated the need to stop trying to fit the Native student into the white educational mold. Instead, it recommended recognizing individual and cultural needs.

In 1934, Congress responded to the Meriam Report by passing two acts, the Indian Reorganization Act (which reaffirmed tribal powers of self-government) and the Johnson O'Malley Act (which provided financial inducements to states to enroll Natives in state public schools).

The Termination Era

New Deal progress was reversed in 1953 when Congress passed, first, the House Concurent Resolution 108, which established the policy of termination of the government-to-government relationship,

and, subsequently, Public Law 83-280. The Act subjected to property taxation the lands of specified Native tribes deemed to be "ready" and ended federal services.

This reactionary strategy was in direct conflict with the previously developed body of Federal Indian Law. "Termination" traumatized and paralyzed Native communities. Finally, in 1965, the Economic Opportunity Act returned some recognition and authority to Native communities by funding tribally directed education programs.

The Self-Determination Era

The Kennedy Report of 1969 proclaimed the state of Native education to be a "national tragedy." Soon to follow were many presidential policy statements and congressional acts aimed at increasing Native self-determination. The Indian Education Act (1972) and the broader Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (1975) provided additional money for Native schools and for Native cultural programs in white schools. In addition, they reiterated federal recognition of tribal sovereignty.

Additional actions since that time have included the following:

- limited Native employment preference in certain federal agencies;
- establishment of the American Indian Policy Review Commission;
- the Indian Child Welfare Act, establishing tribal court participation in Indian child custody cases;
- an attempt to place control of all matters of Native education in Native hands and out of the hands of BIA bureaucracy (Title XI);
- the Indian Tax Status Act, placing tribal governments on the same footing as state governments;
- the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act;
- the Indian Self-Determination Act Amendments of 1988, which explicitly stated the federal government's desire to aid the development of strong and stable tribal governments;

- the declaration of non-taxable fishing rights;
- the Tribally Controlled Schools Act; and
- the Death Penalty Act, acknowledging internal sovereignty in the determination of the application of this penalty.

Contemporary Roles in Native Education

Under the present renewed federal effort to shift responsibility for educating Native students from federally funded BIA and tribal schools to public schools, the roles of various agencies are shifting. In general, the result has been a parallel shift in Native student enrollment. This trend has, in turn, resulted in a real loss of Native control over the educational process, since the Native community and tribal involvement in public education is severely limited.

Recent Supreme Court Decisions

Several cases argued before the Supreme Court in recent years confirm the governmental powers of Native tribes. The Court, for example, has heard cases concerning tribal criminal jurisdiction, treaty rights and tribal sovereignty, taxation and zoning, and tribal courts. The decisions, most attempting to define tribal authority, continue to address conflicts that define the role of tribal governments in issues that also involve various other governments—local, state, and federal.

Models for Conflict Resolution

All reports of recent decades emphasize the necessity for Native control of their educational programs. This emphasis is considered essential to building and maintaining healthy tribal governments, a now explicit goal of the federal government.

In many ways, Natives began to assume this control in 1972, with the creation of Native parent advisory committees. Since then, Congress has continued to increase the legal authority of Natives to control educational programs for their own peoples. A 1990 position paper, presented by the Native American Rights Fund to the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, urges the continued development of new federal policy—and the enactment of legislation to implement policy—to support direct tribal authority over the public schools. Legislative action is important in light of the recent Supreme Court reluctance to extend tribal sovereignty.

Finally, most authorities agree that the academic performance of Native students must be improved. Much disagreement exists, however, over whether improvement could take place at this time if the Native education system were wholly independent of the main American culture.

Summary

By entering into the government-to-government relationship, the United States made a commitment to support Native governments. Only with a properly educated leadership and constituency can Native governments be maintained.

Congress must, therefore, continue to support the authority of Native governments to control Native education. Only with Native control through participation on school boards, parent-teacher interaction, and control of the budget from educational appropriations can Natives hope to make their schools responsive to their needs.

—Summary by Timothy Stark

SUMMARY OF PAPER 4.

Funding and Resources for American Indian and Alaska Native Education

William Brescia

Native Americans are not receiving adequate educational support. Not only is inadequate funding to blame, but also lack of effective governance of that funding. Native parents, community leaders, educators, and officials need to have fiduciary control over Native education. In short, the federal government must support Native self-determination in education.

Spending for Native education (in constant dollars) has fallen since 1975, while overall educational spending has increased. Reversal of this trend must include a shift of focus from the source of funding to its use. This shift should emphasize the attainment of qualitative goals (such as successful completion of a college curriculum by more Natives), not just quantitative goals (such as increasing the attendance at ineffective primary and secondary schools). Funding should also affirmatively address and support the culture of the Native student in the larger educational environment.

Historically, the United States government has promised to educate Natives in the numerous treaties entered with the various tribal governments. These treaties have named specific recipients, funders, and administrators, as well as the type of education to be given. Many, however, were never fulfilled satisfactorily or were allowed to expire. For better or worse, they shaped the contemporary system of Native education in this country.

More recently, world educators have affirmed that for any educational process to be successful, those who are going to be educated must take a leadership role in the process. Native communities must be involved in defining needs and goals, designing delivery systems,

and developing appropriate assessments of their own educational efforts.

Current Funding Practices

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Office of Indian Education (OIE) are the leading sources of funding for Native education. The BIA, for example, operates or funds 166 elementary and secondary schools, two postsecondary schools, and 22 tribally controlled community colleges. The funding cycles of these two federal agencies dominate the life cycle of Native education.

Currently, Native schools are to receive payments equal to those given to public schools in the same district. This system is unfair, however. It fails to take into account the non-federal funding of public schools; the increased cost of operating small schools for remote, sparse populations; or any other special circumstances. Only in Minnesota, where per-pupil expenditures for Native students exceed 150 percent of the national average, is funding adequate for quality education.

BIA schools consistently fall far behind state public school systems that are themselves not educating their students. This fact is easily forgotten if one glances at the innumerable BIA and OIE programs currently funded without noting their weaknesses (shown here in parentheses):

- BIA Programs for School Operations (decreasing appropriations)
  - Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP) Formula and Adjustments (uniformity decreases flexibility regarding local needs)
  - Institutionalized Handicapped
  - School Boards' Expenses and Training
  - Student Transportation (problems with GSA vehicle leases)
  - Solo Parent (only available at two schools; needed nationwide)
  - Technical Support (Agency & MIS)(massive delay in implementation)

  - Substance/Alcohol Abuse Education Program (poorly implemented outside of regular curriculum)

- Johnson-O'Malley Program (fluctuating funding levels)
- Continuing Education
  - Postsecondary School
  - Special Higher Education Scholarships
  - Tribally Controlled Community Colleges (decreasing each year despite rising enrollments)
- Tribe/Agency Operations
  - Scholarships
  - Tribal Colleges Snyder Act Supplement
  - Adult Education
- Department of Education
  - Office of Indian Education (decreasing level of funding)
  - Bilingual Education (lack of proportionate Native staff)
  - Chapter 1—BIA Set-Aside (1.0 percent)
  - Chapter 1 Formula Grants to Local Education Agencies
  - Impact Aid Maintenance and Operations (no advisory board control)
  - Impact Aid Construction P.L. 81-815
  - Vocational Education Set-Aside (1.25 percent)
  - Vocational Rehabilitation Set-Aside (0.25 Percent)

- Institutional Aid
- Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives Program
- Education of the Handicapped P.L. 94-142 Set-Aside (1.25 Percent)
- Math & Science Education Set-Aside (0.5 Percent)
- Drug Free Schools & Communities Set-Aside (1.0 Percent)
- Office of Construction Management (backlog of construction needs; outmoded planning approaches)
- Star Schools (limited to 16 sites currently)
- Adult Education Programs
- State-Administered Basic Grant Program
- National Workplace Literacy (no grants to Natives)
- State-Administered Workplace Literacy Program (no funds)
- State-Administered English Literacy Program (no funds in 1991)
- National English Literacy Demonstration Program for Individuals of Limited English Proficiency
- Adult Migrant Farmworker and Immigrant Education Program
- National Adult Literacy Volunteer Training Program
- State Program Analysis Assistance and Policy Studies (usually does not include separate category for Natives)
- Head Start
- Indian Health Scholarship Program (funding covers only 40 percent of applicants)

- Institute of American Indian Arts
- Minority Science Improvement Program (one of the key builders of science capacity in tribal colleges but more needed)
- Impact Aid (lack of targeting leaves Natives out of decision process)

The reality of the situation, however, is typified by the BIA school, which starts its school year in September but receives its budget for that year as late as the middle of the spring semester due to lack of forward funding.

A clear and worsening problem also exists with recruiting and retaining Native students in postsecondary institutions. Neither enrollment in colleges and universities nor funding of Indian programs at colleges and universities is increasing to match the increasing high school graduation rate or the growth in the college-age Native youth population.

Private Funding

The amount of foundation-giving to Native education is small when compared to total foundation-giving, to the percentage of Native students in the population, or to any other reasonable reference. As a rule, foundations do not have separate programs for Native education. Natives receive money out of a foundation's general interest in education. Native groups need to cultivate their relationships to foundations.

Native Funding

Native funding of Native schools is not only difficult, but impossible, given the meager tax base of most Native communities. Lack of education on the reservation, moreover, perpetuates the lack of a monied class that can be taxed. This cycle cannot be broken solely or even largely with Native funds.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The federal government, along with private philanthropic organizations, must fund Native education following two of the basic principles of the post-World War II Marshall Plan. First, they should support Native self-determination in education; and second, they

should fund the rebuilding of each Native community's infrastructure so that future Native self-funding can become a realistic goal.

The view that current BIA programs can be reformed is no longer credible. The entire Native educational delivery system must be restructured. Native schools need a fair base of funding, infrastructure, and expertise so that they can provide continuous high-quality education, uncompromised by competition with other tribes or other local entities.

—Summary by Timothy Stark

SUMMARY OF PAPER 5.

Native and Non-Native Teachers and Administrators for Elementary and Secondary Schools Serving American Indian and Alaska Native Students

Grayson Noley

The shortage of Native education professionals is an important inhibitor of achievement for Indian children. The need for far greater numbers of Native educators than presently exist is clear. This paper discusses the barriers to improving this situation and the measures taken thus far to overcome these barriers.

History and the Literature

Native educators have served their own as teachers and administrators at least since the 1820s, when Adin C. Gibbs of Delaware taught in the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions schools. Native students, however, have always been—and continue to this day to be—educated for the most part by non-Natives.

A 1974 United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) index claimed that Native school administrators were already employed at parity in American schools. The EEOC, however, defined parity as the ratio of employed Native people to those qualified. The ratio of the proportion of Native administrators to the proportion of Native students, of course, is much less equal. Parity does not exist on that basis. The EEOC report did note that the percentage of Native teachers in schools was both low and declining. And it attributed this circumstance to the small number and limited influence of Native administrators.

To reach parity in the latter sense, according to a paper presented

at the 1983 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, the number of Native administrators would have to *quadruple*. The number of Native administrators and teachers needed is at great odds with the number available and the adequacy of preparation programs. These deficiencies need to be corrected.

Recruitment. Institutional reform for the benefit of minority students began to move slowly forward in the late 1960s. The forces affecting this progress are complex. Recruitment activities, improved admission policies, and new programs of study had to satisfy the ethnic groups they targeted. Simultaneously, the programs had to remain both academically credible and politically viable. Nonetheless, Native student enrollment increased throughout the 1970s and 1980s. It now stands 19 percent higher than it did in 1976.

As a proportion of the higher education population, however, Native enrollment is declining. The literature describes causes that can be summarized as a national tendency to indifference, a governmental departure from affirmative action, and a nationwide tolerance of institutional racism. These barriers appear variously as high-sounding ideological standards (the claimed obligation to accept the "best" students), inconsistency (faculty members not publicly supporting their private positions), and a host of resultant problems. These problems include lack of scholarships, poor secondary school preparation and bridging to higher education, and invalid testing.

Most recently, higher admission standards, purportedly adopted to force secondary schools to improve, are the latest blow to Native student admissions in higher education. This blow comes in conjunction with two additional trends. The first trend is the national shift away from the study of education and toward study in higher paying fields. The second trend is revealed in the results of a recent survey. Thirty-eight percent of the polled higher education institutions acknowledged that their criteria for admission into teacher education hurt minority enrollment.

Existing, successful minority recruitment programs, however, consistently began with an honest assessment of the institutional status quo. After the assessment, university officials followed through with thorough planning, involving the whole university, consulting with the affected community, recruiting both minority students and minority faculty, and improving Native student institutional support systems. Such strategies were, in the most successful programs, fully supported both by institutional and community

leaders. Also integral to improvement was bridging with local school districts; early identification of potential teachers; and especially personal contact with potential students, their parents, and their community leaders.

Other needed changes are: (1) developing incentives to help currently employed Native aides get teacher training, and (2) changing certification requirements to include people who possess rare linguistic and cultural knowledge.

Retention. Most observers view the attrition of Native students as a serious problem. Whereas matriculation comes hard to Native students, leaving is easy.

Reasons for leaving and reasons for staying identified in the literature raise several themes. These themes include (1) alienation of institutional environments; (2) a shortage of identifiable, culturally sensitive role models; and (3) inadequate support groups, poor academic counseling, and lack of financial aid.

Successful retention models stress the cultural needs of Native students. They also add the unusual element of regular and organized involvement of parents and spouses in the educational process.

Training. Historically, the unique recruitment and training needs of Native teachers have received insufficient attention. Postsecondary institutions fail to provide teacher training that equips both Native and non-Native teachers with courses on Indian history, culture, and traditions to prepare them to teach in Native communities.

Good teacher education programs for Natives exhibit several commonalities. These include (1) research-based teacher education programs, (2) proximity of the institution to the students' homes, and (3) the nesting—or grouping—of students to provide special extracurricular services and an accepting climate.

Current Issues and Status Quo

These themes—recruitment, retention, and training—are keys to changing the status quo. They represent not only barriers, but, properly understood, they present opportunities for such change.

Recruitment. While some undergraduate recruitment programs—such as the American Indian Program at Cornell University—are truly targeted and can boast marked success, such examples are unusual. Most recruitment programs alter their traditional methods in superficial ways.

Financial aid is still the premier barrier to college attendance. The dynamics of aid to Native students are, moreover, the subject of a popular misconception. The common view is that Natives can simply ask for funds from their tribes or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Actually, they must seek financial aid in the same manner as all other Americans, through proof of eligibility. Also, social alienation continues: prospective Native students often find that no support group exists on the campuses they might attend.

Much of the progress realized through open enrollment is being threatened by the recent call for higher admissions standards, even though no indication exists that open enrollment lowers graduation requirements. Finally, inadequate secondary school preparation and the self-fulfilling prophecy of low expectations continue to exert their negative effects among Native students.

Recruitment of Native teachers into actual teaching positions, according to the EEOC, is still lagging due to low pay, discrimination, and teacher unwillingness or inability to go where positions are available. As previously noted, this circumstance would be remedied, at least in part, by the placement of additional Native administrators.

Preference for Native applicants to administrative positions, however, is not legally mandated (as it is for teaching positions) except for BIA positions. Several programs designed to encourage the pursuit of certification in school administration by Native educators already employed in participating schools have been quite successful. Unfortunately, individual boards of education rarely guarantee employment to degree recipients.

Retention. Where institutions act to create a hospitable campus climate for Native students, the retention and graduation of Native students improves. A Native student cultural center—and the routine support and social services it provides—encourages students to succeed. Other measures that improve matters are (1) providing budgeting services for personal funds, (2) encouraging participation in academic and extra-academic activities, and (3) advising that is sensitive to such special needs as poor secondary schooling. In sum, institutions clearly benefit from responsive measures that personalize their relationships with students.

Training. Colleges of education benefit from the numerous useful attributes of both nested and home-study training programs. In each case, tribally controlled community colleges can provide the first two

years of a four-year program. Development of these programs both augments and requires healthy cooperation between the community colleges, the teacher-training institution, the tribes, and the local school districts.

Conclusions

A renewed effort by institutions of higher education to enhance their services to Native communities is needed to avert a worsening crisis. Federal, tribal, and state governments—as well as institutions of higher education themselves—should seek serious self-assessment, and then continue to act innovatively in concert with those they serve.

—Summary by Timothy Stark

SUMMARY OF PAPER 6.

Continuous Evaluation of Native Education Programs forAmerican Indian and Alaska Native Students

Richard Nichols

The history of federal education policy is a story of changing beliefs about the best way to educate American Indian and Alaska Native children. Early this century, the progressive education movement influenced a plan that viewed Native communities and governments as worthy of recognition in their own right. By mid-century, federal policy had become assimilationist, aimed at mainstreaming Native people as quickly as possible. All along, Native peoples have held onto the goals of sustaining their cultures and achieving economic self-sufficiency, even as non-Native observers have considered these goals incompatible.

This lack of agreement on policy resulted in disagreement about evaluation models. And, since officials use evaluations of results to decide future policy, the disagreements have shaped reforms and led to further evaluations. After enduring so many evaluation studies that document Native student failure, Native students, parents, and Elders now find them tiresome. Today, the choice of an evaluation model is particularly important since most Native students attend public schools, which are themselves undergoing review and reform.

Effective strategies can act as plans for reforming the evaluation system into an ongoing one that is agreeable to all. To evaluate, we must *first understand how the services are delivered.*

- The federal government funds Native education through two departments:
  - U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), which operates schools and funds tribally operated schools; and

- U. S. Department of Education, which provides supplemental grants on a competitive basis to public schools, BIA-operated and tribally operated schools, institutions of higher education, and Indian organizations.

- State and local public school districts now bear most of the responsibility for Native students.

- Native governments operate schools at all levels (K-12 and tribal colleges) and advocate for their constituents in dealing with other governmental bodies.

Next, we should identify the issues that relate to Native education evaluation. Although there are several data collection and analysis projects underway, no national database on Native education exists—a situation that should be remedied.

Native and non-Native groups have different evaluation needs, and the final set of measurements must have value to all who have a stake in Native education. Finally, our evaluation model must contain elements that are responsive and that offer Native people information they can use to promote success rather than to document failure.

Evaluation and Federal Education Programs

Though public schools are the principal providers of services to Native students, most of the program funding comes from the federal government. So, it is important to understand the evaluation of evaluation in federal education policy.

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act contained the Title I (compensatory education) program, which consisted of new funding and evaluation requirements. Evaluation included in the bill was meant to ensure that the money got used in response to what parents thought their children needed. Unfortunately, this bill's passage coincided with introduction of the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS). The government had been using PPBS—a systems analysis model—in the Pentagon and now expanded its use to other areas. PPBS evaluations concentrated not on responsiveness, but on cost efficiency—the production function. This Title I evaluation was implemented to assess efficiency rather than effectiveness.

During its first few years, Title I evaluations did not satisfy federal staff. The Assistant Secretary for Program Evaluation (ASPE) staff commissioned studies and began collecting data to find ways to analyze the cost-benefit of its programs. When test scores showed no gains, ASPE began to centralize contol of program inputs and design in addition to evaluation. The Follow Through program was among the first to be used as a guinea pig for planned variation and other "experimental design" ideas to aid in evaluation. Planners introduced the use of sponsors (i.e., specialists with special instructional models) to the Follow Through program.

ASPE hired outside evaluators who announced intentions of using a broad array of criteria to evaluate Title I programs. Still, from 1968-1971, they used only cognitive tests, which showed no positive Follow Through effects. Community groups and sponsors protested. They believed the programs met local needs and that evaluators showed bias in looking solely at production.

Because of these protests, evaluators added some noncognitive tests in 1972-73. Parents remained unhappy. They felt that experts wanted a program they knew how to measure, instead of one that met the needs of Native students. This time, evaluators ignored the criticisms, isolating the national evaluation process from stakeholder politics. Thus, the evaluation goal for Follow Through changed from a focus on the total effects of the program to determining which model gave the most effect for the dollar.

The evaluation battles then shifted to the Head Start program, but the focus remained on efficiency concerns. Education researchers have challenged this systems analysis approach, arguing that there are many more important factors than cost in raising test scores. Researchers Yvonna Lincoln and Egon Guba are among those who advocate the use of participatory models. Some have proposed their "naturalistic inquiry" model as appropriate for evaluating Native education.

Another problem with evaluation showed up in a 1980's study of Indian Education Act (IEA) programs. The IEA legislation expanded the definition of "Indian" to include many students previously not considered Natives. The 1990 Census figures confirm a cause for concern, as they show three times as many American Indians as the 1960 Census counted. This cannot be due simply to an increased birth rate, so other factors must be involved. Apparent gains may simply reflect the fact that the students not previously considered Indian were closer to national norms than the original population. Clearly,

we must consider the changing nature of the database if we wish to make legitimate comparisons.

Evaluation Issues

Paradigms—examples or models that help us to compare things—are often used by theorists. The old paradigm included centralized government, one organizing ideology, one big idea, one big solution. The new paradigm harks back to the 1960s and to the empowerment of people who had little or no access to decisionmaking. This system uses grassroots actions and pragmatic strategies to figure out what works, why it works, and how to share the information. The resulting evaluation strategies provide useful information for groups working at the national level and groups directly affected by the policies and programs.

Data Collection at the National Level

Since 1928 almost every study related to Native education has pointed out the need for a national database. A 1969 congressional report recommended that the BIA should develop and maintain these data. Established in 1972, the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE) began overseeing all federal education programs for Native children. Lacking resources to establish a database, NACIE said the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) should be directed by the Administration and Congress to compile this information.

Data from a variety of sources suggest that about 90 percent of Native students now attend public schools that receive Department of Education funds earmarked for Native students—totaling more than $54 million in FY 90. In FY 89, the federal government provided $247 million through the Federal Impact Aid Program, and $23 million through the Johnson O'Malley Program. The amount of money involved seems to justify including Native student data as a special subsample in all NCES efforts, but that still is not policy.

Presently, NACIE coordinates collection of data on Native education from various federal agencies. The BIA has begun to report some data from its schools. Also, the BIA says it will establish a research and evaluation component to monitor the progress of Indian students on Indian lands. This will cover only a small part of the total Native student population—only those attending BIA-funded schools.

Since NCES and BIA provide only small amounts of data, the only large source is NACIE's compilation from various federal agencies. A

truly effective effort would require additional funding. NCES must take on the data collection and analysis responsibility if the U. S. government is to meet the special needs of Native students.

Data Collection at the State and Local Levels

Despite being on the spot, state and Native governments and the public schools are doing no better at coordinating data collection efforts than the federal government. Data exist, but only in piecemeal form. Montana's TRACKS program is a good model for comprehensive data collection at the state level.

TRACKS grew out of research conducted by Dull Knife Community College and the Northern Cheyenne Dropout Project. The project director worked with three schools and their personnel, following entire Indian student populations for three years. College students conducted most of the data collection entry, analysis, and writing, which made the project affordable. Working at the local level kept the focus on Indian students, whereas national level surveys often included only a small sample of Native students.

The best state-level projects have tended to be those conducted by state universities and tribal colleges. Perhaps special efforts should be made to coordinate efforts among universities, including tribal colleges, to lead this effort across states.

Native governments that have worked on data collection have done it because they see the link between good statistical information and economic development. Native organizations, especially in urban areas, are providing good information on education. Regional Educational Laboratories, funded by the Department of Education, could help to coordinate these data collection efforts. Unfortunately, the tribes, local school districts, and states aren't working to coordinate their projects, nor can they agree on whose responsibility it is to do so.

Standardized Tests and Native Performance

Four types of commercially available standardized tests most often guide placement and grading—achievement, aptitude, ability, and intelligence tests.

The public education system's reliance on standardized achievement tests may have hurt Native students, for many factors can bias these tests against them. Students whose language background is non- or substandard English may read and interpret tests incorrectly.

Native cultural values that discourage competitive behaviors also can put students at a disadvantage.

Despite these concerns, states and public school systems continue to use standardized tests to gauge academic success. Now, *Education Week* calls for competency testing at the national level. If Congress funds a national achievement test and makes it mandatory in public and private schools, Native students may do even more poorly. Critics often cite the SAT—even though it is an aptitude test, not an achievement test—as an example of bias in testing. When divided along racial/ethnic and gender lines, "white" males produce the best SAT scores. This group then gains the advantage when colleges decide which students to accept.

Today groups such as FairTest are part of a movement within the educational community that questions the use of standardized tests. As Native educators have looked at student performance, they have relied less on test scores and more on measures of student satisfaction, such as dropout rates. More positive measures such as graduation rates and college enrollment would be the best criteria of success.

Current and Potential Performance Indicators

Educators are looking for more authentic indicators of learning. The National Center on Effective Secondary Schools (NCESS) uses the term "authentic work" to describe tasks that students consider "meaningful, valuable, significant and worthy of one's efforts." The term includes both indicators of achievement and day-to-day activities, elements of the curriculum. By this standard, learning is an active process. Students must master essential tasks instead of recalling basic facts. Because of Native cultural traditions, this style of learning is well suited to many tribal groups that respect an individual's ability to learn from experience, without constant supervision and correction. Moreover, observers criticize many current teaching and assessment methods as unresponsive to different learning styles in both Native and non-Native students.

BIA's Bureau of Effective Schools Teams (BEST) initiative has developed some alternative measures that could serve as potential systemic indicators in the evaluation of Native education. The BEST measures include:

- Criterion-referenced tests (teacher-made tests)
- Portfolios of student progress, such as writing samples

- Extracurricular participation rates and increases in the variety of such activities
- Increased attendance and graduation rates
- Decreased vandalism rates
- Increased ability of a school to keep students and staff
- Implementation of new curriculum initiatives
- Increased participation by parents and community members
- Staff development and facilities improvement

Not all these measures would be useful in comparing one school to another, but many would. And, with a little effort, measures like student portfolios could be compared across a sample of schools to provide information about systemic performance.

Connecticut has developed a "Common Core of Learning" for its students, a comprehensive set of knowledge and traits against which students are individually assessed. Designers of the "core" based it on recommendations made by the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Science, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and other groups. Teaching and testing concentrate on mastery of skills, so that, in science, the student must show how to use specific equipment. In language arts, students must produce writing samples and take notes to show listening comprehension.

The National Commission on the Skills of the American Work Force has made recommendations for assessing mastery of skills and subject areas. Several states are now considering or incorporating those suggestions as well.

Clearly, Native education must examine current systemic indicators being used, and if necessary adopt some alternative performance indicators if such are likely to be more useful.

Stakeholder Groups

All parties involved in Native education need to have their concerns and perspectives addressed in evaluations. Providers (schools, states, federal agencies, Native governments, and Elders), consumers (Native students, parents and governments) and monitors (governments, states, Elders, and Native parents) need different data. Evalu-

ators must use different procedures and reporting formats to provide information useful to these different groups.

Parents are the primary stakeholders in Native education evaluation. They want more than statistical information that details their children's failure to meet a mythical norm. They want information that will help them change the schools to raise performance levels. Often, parents with children in public schools can't get any information about how Native students compare with the rest of the student body. Parents need this critically important information when students might be eligible for Indian Education Act (IEA) grant projects.

Native parents also need to know about programs that are succeeding with disadvantaged, low-income, multicultural, and bilingual students, in addition to those designed for Native students. Native parents and Elders want to make preservation of Native languages and cultures priority items, so future evaluation procedures must identify effective programs.

As both providers and consumers, Native governments need easy access to evaluation data. There must be closer coordination between the governments and the state education agencies. But this can't happen until the states and local school districts realize their special obligation to Native students. The states, after years of dealing with civil rights issues, tend to consider Native students like other minority groups. If they were to treat Natives differently, they feel, they would be open to charges of discrimination from other groups. Native groups must take the lead in making states realize that their status is unique, as Natives in Minnesota are now doing.

Strategies for Continuous Evaluation

The Department of Education and BIA may have information available that would help them to make informed decisions. Federal agencies, state education representatives, and Indian Nations At Risk Task Force hearings can provide statistics. These should be used to take evaluation beyond the discrepancy-based models that mainly show lack of Native achievement. Determining how well the schools are serving Native students is the first objective, and indicators such as dropout and absenteeism rates can help measure the schools' responsiveness. Comparing these indicators across the three school systems—federal, state/local, Native-operated—can give students and parents useful information.

As for discrepancy evaluation, Montana's TRACKS program is

good. So is the evaluation system used by the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon. It calls for Native educators to establish standards for Indian education programs. Standards should be set jointly by public schools and Native groups. They should be above and beyond the objectives of the IEA-funded projects and extend across school curricula and programs.

Most important in evaluation of Native education is finding out what is working and why it is working. We must go inside the big picture of national failure to refocus on snapshots of localized success. The Department of Education and BIA must look at ways to learn more about areas where little research has been done. For instance, once we know the dropout rate, we should find out why some students drop out and others don't.

The Role of Naturalistic Inquiry

The INAR hearing record clearly shows that present evaluation models aren't working well, since they don't help with solving problems. It's time to move toward an evaluation model that will empower the participants by helping them understand the complex network of relationships that makes up the education system. This model could be based on one devised for the Indian Health Service (Charleston, 1990). This model operates on principles of naturalistic inquiry, or fourth- generation evaluation, which evolved from earlier models of social and educational research.

Applying a model could help to move future evaluation beyond the present clash of goals. Lincoln and Guba (1985) developed the principles of naturalistic inquiry to be responsive to the goals of a complex organization. Naturalistic inquiry uses ordinary language to communicate with nontechnical audiences such as teachers and the public. It uses informal, everyday reasoning to understand the everyday world as people actually experience it.

Naturalistic evaluation recognizes that there are competing claims, concerns, and issues to consider, making it necessary to arrive at findings useful to the various stakeholder groups.

Naturalistic inquiry derives from the work of Schwartz and Ogilvy (1980), who have analyzed and reported the emergence of new ideas in a variety of fields. These emerging ideas in physics, chemistry, evolution, math, and other disciplines define the world in a much different way than traditional ideas.

The new paradigm based on these ideas has seven major character-

istics that are more compatible with traditional beliefs about the world and reality than the old paradigm. These characteristics include: complexity, heterarchy, holography, indeterminacy, mutual causality, morphogenesis, and perspective. Native peoples view the world as complex, and interconnected in nonlinear relationships (or heterarchic). They also believe the world to be dynamic, unknowable (or indeterminant), and to be changing and moving in several simultaneous cycles (or having mutual causality). The world to them is growing as a whole (possesses morphogenesis) and consists of many perspectives. That description also could apply to the Native education system. But Indian education has always undergone old paradigm evaluations that fail to examine it in its entirety. The emergent paradigm offers a view much more in line with the intergovernmental, multiprogrammatic, and culturally diverse realities and conflicting goals of Native education. Instead of viewing it as a chaotic and unplanned organism, the paradigm offers a way of explaining this complex system.

A Model for Continuous Evaluation

Naturalistic evaluation presents step-by-step strategies for ensuring that all stakeholder groups receive the information they need equally. As outlined by Guba and Lincoln (and simplified here), the basic components are:

1. Identify the full array of stakeholders, leaving the way open for inclusion of any new groups.

2. Elicit each group's concerns and interests. Use an open-ended process that will present an insider's, not an outsider's, view.

3. Provide a context and methodology that will allow different perspectives to be understood, critiqued, and considered.

4. Work within groups, and between groups, to arrive at a consensus about as many of these differences as possible.

5. Prepare an agenda for negotiation on items about which there is incomplete or no consensus. The evaluator must find a way to put priorities on unresolved items without disempowering any stakeholders.

6. Collect and provide the information needed for the purposes of negotiation.

7. Establish and mediate a forum of stakeholder representatives to handle negotiations. Differences should be reviewed in the light of new information with the goal of reducing their number. Some items will likely remain unresolved and later rounds of evaluation will be scheduled. Negotiations aren't successful unless they result in definitive action.

8. Keep all stakeholder groups informed about the progress of reaching consensus or resolution on issues they have raised.

9. Recycle the evaluation again. New aspects of an issue may emerge because of the first-round evaluation. Fourth- generation evaluations are never completed.

Naturalistic evaluation methods rely heavily on collecting and passing along information. The case study approach is an important element. Descriptive studies of Native education programs, claims and concerns would be a step forward in presenting evaluations useful to stakeholders. The continuing communication and review of information will be critical, and the education providers must be willing to respond to the different perspectives of each stakeholding group.

By providing for continuing evaluations that can (1) address each group, (2) provide formats for reporting, and (3) aid the exchange of data among Native Elders, educators, parents, and leaders, we may begin to agree on a new direction for Native education.

—Summary by Nancy Balow

References

Charleston, G. M. (1990). Organizational structure and naturalistic inquiry in the Indian Health Services. *Indian Health Service Handbook, II*. Baltimore, MD: National Evaluation Symposium.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Schwartz, P., & Ogilvy, J. (1980). *The emergent paradigm: changing patterns of thought and belief* (Analytical Report 7, Values and Lifestyles Program). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

SUMMARY OF PAPER 7.

Early Childhood Education in American Indian and Alaska Native Communities

Alice S. Paul

Trends in early childhood education for American Indians and Alaska Natives have reflected those in the larger society. As society moves forward in its efforts to improve conditions for early childhood care and education, deeper issues must be considered by Native Americans. Programs for young Native children need to be designed within the context of each child's culture, home language, and family. This cannot be done without community input and support.

Research findings support the critical nature of the formative years of a child's life and the importance of active involvement of young children with their environment. Activities can take place in both the Native language and the language of the school. Ideally, the younger-aged children should be taught in their home language. Critical to social development of very young children is learning to appreciate, respect, and take pride in their culture.

The issue of early childhood education cannot be discussed without consideration of the family. Successful programs such as Head Start and Follow Through encourage parents to become involved in the school. The parent and the school must both work cooperatively in rearing and educating young children. The gap that has existed for too long must be closed in order for American Indian and Alaska Native children to move successfully back and forth between home and school. The following strategies will help build links between home and early childhood education programs:

- Link home learning with school learning.

- Involve parents as active participants in decisionmaking regarding education, health, and community policy.
- Use Elders, parents, and community members as resources.
- Offer parents educational and self-improvement opportunities.
- Set aside release time so that teachers can visit the homes of their students.
- Assist teachers in becoming aware and participating members of the community.
- Endorse the use of the school for community events and meetings.
- Educate non-Native teachers and administrators about Native language, culture, history, and values.

The current definition of readiness focuses the blame for early school failure on the child through a deficit model. Instead, schools should meet students where they are, developmentally and experientially, and should then provide them with experiences necessary to help each child reach his or her full potential. Schools should not be in the business of compensatory education; instead, they should support and enhance the culturally bound and individually determined readiness skills with which all children come to school. Student learning to make choices is a critical part of such a curriculum.

Communities have an important role to play in supporting strong early childhood education programs. Trust must be developed between the community and the teachers so that teachers can consider themselves advisors and community members can make decisions about curriculum and other educational policy issues. Each community must examine its available services and how collaboration might better serve young children and their families. Evaluation must move to a more qualitative model designed to provide feedback to communities.

The following are additional strategies for providing successful early care and education:

- Train more Native teachers and administrators through incentives to enter the field of education and to use alternative certification procedures.

- Include cultural awareness courses in teacher training.
- Hire Native aides trained in child development principles as language and cultural models.
- Increase Head Start availability for all who wish to participate.
- Establish a culturally based curriculum relevant to the local community.
- Promote, maintain, and encourage Native language use.

By helping children maintain their Native culture, schools nurture self-identity and build a strong foundation for secure adulthood.

—Summary by Barbara Merrill

SUMMARY OF PAPER 8.

Plans for Dropout Prevention and Special School Support Services for American Indian and Alaska Native Students

Jon Reyhner

American Indian and Alaska Native students have a dropout rate twice the national average—the highest dropout rate of any United States ethnic or racial group. About three out of every ten Native students drop out of school before graduating from high school both on reservations and in cities. Academically capable Native students often drop out of school because their needs are not being met. Others are pushed out because they protest in a variety of ways how they are treated in school.

As the psychiatrist Erik Erikson has pointed out, positive identity formation is an ongoing, cumulative process. It starts in the home with a trusting relationship established between mother and child. It then develops through the child's interaction with other children and adults. To build a strong positive identity, new adults with whom a child interacts need to reinforce and build on the cultural messages that the child has previously received. But, too often in schools today, teachers do not reinforce what Native parents show and tell their children. This produces cultural discontinuity between home and school. Native children must choose between their Native heritage and school success, usually with disastrous results. Many turn to drugs and alcohol to resolve problems associated with poor self-images resulting from this cultural discontinuity between home and school. Teaching methods and school curricula must be changed to reduce this cultural conflict. Also, community-based counseling should be made available to Native teenagers who already suffer from this form of identity conflict.

To help Native students form positive, mature identities and to reduce the number of Native dropouts, several steps must be taken:

- large schools must be restructured to allow teachers to know and interact with their students;
- caring teachers (especially Native teachers) must be recruited who will spend the time it takes to teach and to learn from Native students;
- these caring teachers must use active teaching strategies to motivate students;
- Native curriculum must be developed and used in Native schools to reduce cultural discontinuity;
- testing must be used in schools for helping students learn instead of tracking them into nonacademic programs; and
- parents must have the power to ensure that schools give their children an education that will strengthen, not weaken, Native families.

Academic student advocacy programs, such as the ones sponsored by the American Indian Science and Engineering Society and by tribal colleges, need to be encouraged.

Both on and off reservations, many schools are not providing an appropriate education for Native students. These schools have failed to provide teachers trained to instruct Native students or a curriculum that acknowledges their heritage. Schools regularly use culturally biased tests to push Native students out of academic programs. The supplemental add-on programs—such as the Indian Education Act, Johnson O'Malley (JOM), bilingual education, special education, and other recent federal programs—have had little success in improving the education of Indian children. Add-on programs can only be a first step. Native education must be viewed holistically with basic skills, Native studies, and other classes. Both curriculum and dropout prevention programs must be approached holistically. Students do not drop out of school simply because of academic failure, drug and alcohol abuse, or any other single problem. Too often, well-meaning, add-on remedial programs focus on finding the reason for failure in students and their homes, "blaming the victims." These programs

treat the symptoms instead of the root problem—the cultural conflict that exists between students and teachers. The idea that Native students are "culturally disadvantaged" or "culturally deprived" reflects an ethnocentric bias that should not continue. When schools do not recognize, value, and build on what Native students learn at home, students suffer. They receive a watered-down, slowed-down curriculum meant to guarantee student learning. Often, students are "bored out" of school. This traditional school approach has failed many students. Ironically, students who drop out get blamed for failing the system.

Beyond correcting these problems to prevent future dropouts, more must be done to help those who have already dropped out. Retrieval programs, such as the General Educational Development (GED) program and community-based drug prevention programs, can help undo some of the harm from a regular education. In addition, the negative image of vocational programs needs to be removed and these programs opened to all students. In particular, vocational programs should be tied to real jobs through partnerships with business, labor unions, and government.

Dropout prevention starts with caring teachers who give students every chance for success by using interactive and experiential teaching methods, and relevant and culturally appropriate curriculum. At-risk students need peer support through cooperative instructional methodologies and peer counseling programs. Dropout prevention also includes support services from school administrators and counselors who work closely with parents.

If receiving appropriate training in colleges of teacher education continues to be a problem, local solutions must be found. Staff must be trained to teach their Native students effectively. This necessarily will include training in understanding the value of Native languages, history, and culture. Parents and local school boards also need ongoing training about what works in Native education and what schools can do. Tribal education departments and tribal colleges must support the efforts of Head Start and the public schools as they design and implement effective educational programs that honor Native heritages.

Recommendations

The following recommendations offer guidance in designing and carrying out effective dropout prevention programs:

1. Special programs for students such as those provided by the Indian Education Act must be continued, but they must be integrated into a culture-based curriculum. The new schoolwide Chapter 1 programs are a step in the right direction.

2. Teachers of Native students must be trained in teaching methods that have been proven effective with Native students. Some of these include: cooperative learning, holistic learning, experiential education, interactive learning, bilingual education, and ESL.

3. School boards and administrators should be encouraged to limit the size of new schools. When this is not possible, schools should be structured in ways that reduce student anonymity and alienation.

4. School boards and administrators should cease tracking Native students and begin the practice of heterogeneous grouping.

5. Native students should be encouraged to take more science and mathematics classes by introducing advocacy programs such as those conducted by the American Indian Science and Engineering Society. Challenging students academically reduces student boredom, a major reason why students leave school.

6. Schools must use alternatives to failing students in grade, suspending them, and expelling them.

7. All Native communities that want them should have K-12 day schools. The Havasupai and Navajo reservations need special attention in this regard. If Alaska can provide village high schools, the BIA should be able to make an equal effort without lawsuits.

8. The BIA and ED should do more to promote development of site-based Native education departments. Help is needed to develop teacher-training programs that can be operated in cooperation with tribal community colleges and four-year colleges. These Native education departments also could develop tribal curriculum guidelines and materials to support school efforts. Further, they would be in the best position to develop reservation-wide dropout prevention programs that keep track of students and

provide community-based intervention, support, and treatment programs. The development of Native curriculum and the further development of tribal education departments must proceed as mandated by Public Law 100-297, Section 51-6. Thus far, the BIA has refused to carry out this act or its predecessor, 25 CFR 32.4.

9. Often called the "51st state," the BIA should provide a Native teacher certification and school accreditation program. Native education departments should provide specific language, history, and culture endorsements and standards. This certification and accreditation would then be acceptable in all BIA-funded schools.

10. More funding of educational research is needed on what works for teaching Native students. This research should be conducted with Native education departments and tribal colleges.

11. A publication program for tribal curriculum and textbooks must commence. It should be sponsored by ED and BIA in cooperation with tribal education departments, tribal colleges, and university Native American studies programs.

12. A national campaign to deglamorize the use of alcohol and tobacco must be initiated. Beer and wine advertisements must be banned from television. Linking of athletic events with alcoholic beverages and tobacco products must be ended.

—Summary by the author

SUMMARY OF PAPER 9.

Improving Parental Participation in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indian and Alaska Native Students

Robin A. Butterfield and Floy Pepper

Distinguishing Between Parental Involvement and Parental Support

There is a distinction between the terms "parental involvement" and "parental support." Parental support means encouraging children to value education and to achieve. Parental involvement includes participating in school life in supportive advisory and decisionmaking roles.

Parental support is essential and realistic for most Native parents. Parental involvement is desirable, but may be unrealistic for many Native parents. All schools need both parental support and involvement, but parental support has the greatest impact on the achievement, behavior, and attitudes of students.

Historical Barriers for Native Parents

Historically, the federal government's assimilation strategy removed Native children from their families to attend boarding schools. When the federal government removed children from their families, entire generations lost access to Native parenting models, culture, language, and traditional values. The coercive assimilation policy produced schools that fail to recognize the importance and validity of the Indian community. The community retaliated by treating the school as an alien institution. The process of rebuilding communities and educating or reeducating Native parents will require tremendous time, energy, and commitment by schools and tribal communities.

Key Issues for American Indian/Alaska Native Parents

Staff attitude. Native people continue to have concerns about the attitudes and behaviors of educational staff who seem uninformed about Native cultures and who are unwilling to change behavior. Such educator attitudes contribute to racism. Moreover, high staff turnover in rural, isolated Native schools disrupts systematic planning for high-quality instruction.

School environment. Inaccessible physical locations and poor conditions of many school buildings also influence Native parents' perceptions of schools. Schools that do not integrate Native culture into the curriculum send the message that education has little to do with the everyday life of Native people. By contrast, schools with Native themes in hallways and bulletin boards validate the Native community they serve.

Declining Native parent participation. Schools tend to involve parents less and less as children progress through the grades. Since Native students begin dropping out at the junior high school level, involvement and support of Native parents should increase rather than decrease. The departmentalization of junior high and high schools further isolates and alienates Native students and their parents from the schools. Parents need to prepare students for what to expect and support them in coping.

Native community issues. Many factors continue to inhibit Native parental participation with schools. Dynamics over which large numbers of Native parents have little control include illiteracy, low socioeconomic status, poor parental self-esteem, dysfunctional family relationships, and poor health conditions. Movement from school to school is an issue that can detrimentally affect student achievement and parental participation. Issues related to the nature of Native extended families are often neither acknowledged nor understood by educational staff. Extended family members may be very effective supporters of education for Native children.

Reservation schools. Because of reservation schools' isolation and unique funding requirements, reservation communities face additional hurdles over which Native parents must negotiate.

Urban schools. Urban Native families face rapid social change and the lack of culturally sensitive services. One devastating aspect of Native life in the urban area is the use of alcohol and drugs. Deseg-

regation has scattered and isolated Native students from their peers and has diluted funding targeted for Native cultural programs and support services. Because of their isolation and insecurity, many urban parents require exceptional support and assistance.

Review of Research on Parent Participation

According to the research, parent participation in almost any form improves parental attitudes and behaviors, as well as student achievement, attendance, motivation, self-esteem, and behavior. Successful programs must have the commitment of district and school administrators. They also require ongoing training for staff to improve communication with parents. Lastly, a successful program should include a variety of options so that parents can select the activities most appropriate for themselves and their children. Parental participation changes as children progress through school.

Many within the Indian community view changes in parental involvement in schools as a crucial part of the Indian Education Act. The Indian Education Act clearly defines the makeup and responsibility of project parent committees. At least half the committee members must be parents of Native students. The committee has authority over planning, monitoring, and evaluating the project. Because of the project, parents have developed the ability to function in the school and community, acquired specific skills to help their children in school, and generally taken a greater interest in school.

Review of Literature on Cultural Influences

Traditional values and child rearing practices. Native child rearing is self-exploratory, not of restrictive. Children learn that respect for individual freedom, dignity, and autonomy are Native values. Through example, children learn skills of cooperation, group harmony, and extended family that are necessary for the survival of the Native family and the tribal group. American Indians and Alaska Natives often value placidity, patience, and the ability to remain silent. These cultural influences have a powerful effect on the Native child's performance in school.

Parental influence on self-esteem. Children look to others, particularly their parents, to confirm or deny that they are important. To have high self-esteem, children must experience the conditions that result when parents affirm the child's sense of:

- connectiveness—by letting children know that they belong and are accepted,
- uniqueness—by letting children know that what they did or said was special,
- power—by letting children realize that they are confident and can be successful, and
- models—by letting children know that their goals and standards are appropriate and important.

When a child has low self-esteem, parents will observe weakness in all the above conditions.

Home-school communication. Schools can engage in ongoing positive communication with parents through joint decisionmaking improved school-community relations, as allies in problem-solving, and as part of the student service delivery system. Schools should provide a clearly defined procedure for parent communication, requests, information, visits, and participation. However, schools need to use opportunities—newsletters, Native public meetings, positive reports on Native students' behavior, and parental resource persons for classrooms.

Child development and parent education. Native communities have traditionally considered that the formative years of each child are crucial and have provided early childhood learning. Successful programs build on positive attitudes, values, and beliefs learned very early in life.

Successful Models

Models that build more effective parental support. Models that build more effective parental support focus on improving the one-on-one relationship of Native parents or extended family members with the Native student and the classroom teacher. They show parents more productive, supportive behaviors, which can significantly improve educational outcomes for their children. The following models include some critical variables that seem particularly effective with American Indian/Alaska Native parents. These activity-oriented models include:

- Positive Indian Parenting—building on Native traditional child-rearing practices;
- New Parents as Teachers—actively involving new parents in schools;
- Family Math—a co-learning program for parents and children;
- Family Science—similar to Family Math, but in science; and
- Preparing for the Drug-Free Years—teaching parental prevention strategies.

Models that encourage Native parental involvement. A variety of federal legislation encourages local school districts to consult with Native parent groups. Most require committees to help formulate policy and practice at the local level. Legislation includes:

- Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934,
- Bilingual Education Act of 1968,
- Indian Education Act of 1972 (currently known as "Title V"),
- Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (P.L. 93-638; commonly called "638"),
- Tribally-Controlled Community College Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-561 or "561"),
- Title XI of the Education Amendments Act of 1978,
- Impact Aid, and
- Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1981 (formerly "Title I").

Other models that encourage Native parental involvement are:

- Warm Springs Memorandum of Understanding, which promotes clear understanding of the roles, interest, and expectations of each

agency for the education of tribal students at Warm Springs, Oregon;

- Blandin Foundation, which supports the advancement of Native educational excellence by providing incentives for Native parental support and involvement in Minnesota;

- Minnesota Indian Social Work Aides, which trains Native community members as social work aides for students with special education needs; and

- Minnesota Indian Education Act, which improves Native education through programs designated to meet special needs and enable access to educational opportunities, Native consultation and representation, and leadership by the Minnesota State Board of Education.

Strategies for Increasing Native Parental Support and Involvement

Strategies for local school districts and tribes. Strategies at the local level require that schools begin to change their images to ones of centers of advocacy for all children and families. As advocates, schools can help empower parents. Successful strategies include:

- trust-building through outreach to Native parents;

- transformational leaders willing to involve Native communities in decisionmaking;

- Native cultural awareness classes for staff emphasizing Native cultural strengths;

- home-school advocates;

- parent-teacher conferences that are well planned and culturally respectful;

- Native parent education and study groups, including opportunities concerning child development, drug and alcohol prevention,

literacy, parent-child support, and language and culture reinforcement;

- Native involvement in policy development, discipline, and curriculum development and review; and

- tribal involvement in decisionmaking at the local level.

Strategic plans for state and federal agencies. At the state and federal levels, a great deal more could be done to encourage the participation of Native parents, including the following strategies:

- mandating parent advisory committees at the local school district level,

- enforcing regulations to ensure Native parental involvement,

- offering incentive grants to local school districts for outreach to Native communities,

- providing technical assistance in both parental involvement and parental support,

- developing and distributing effective parent education materials,

- monitoring exemplary programs and supporting research that captures successful parent participation strategies, and

- supporting the notion that schools should be the centers of advocacy for all children and families.

Conclusion

Native parental participation in the education process, both as decisionmakers ("involvement") and as encouragers of individual students ("support"), has long been the critical ingredient missing in Native education. Models exist that can be adapted widely in Native communities. These models describe how commitment and creativity can overcome the dismal socioeconomic issues and conditions that confront all areas of Native education.

—Summary by Barbara Merrill

SUMMARY OF PAPER 10:

Teaching Through Traditions: Incorporating Native Languages and Cultures into Curricula

Linda Skinner

American Indian and Alaska Native students have experienced a history of ethnocentricism that has permeated the European-American educational establishment from its federal government sponsors down to the local level. Native students have been subject to a barrage of educational "remedies" over the past 500 years. These remedies have ranged from assimilation tactics of cultural and linguistic genocide to the compensatory "band-aid" programs that, all too often, treat the symptom instead of cure the problem. The effect has been to relegate our children to a dependent, inferior role in society.

Schools in the United States have made every effort possible to assimilate Native students. They have tried to make Native students speak the same, dress the same, wear their hair the same, even to think and believe the same as the European-American culture. Educators viewed any evidence of a student's attachment to Native culture as an act of defiance.

A report of the Board of Indian Commissioners (1880) even insisted that industrial boarding schools were far better than day schools for Native children: "The children being removed from the idle and corrupting habits of savage homes are more easily led to adopt the customs of civilized life and inspired with a desire to learn."

Typically, Native children have attended schools where teachers forbade them to speak their Native languages and taught them only in English. Even today, 17 states have English-only laws. This has resulted in the loss of hundreds of Native languages. Only 206 languages remain of the more than 600 languages that once existed. Of the remaining languages, about 50 are on the death list, with fewer than 10 elderly speakers still living.

When a language dies, an entire cultural code goes with it. Words that explain kinship, relationships, and other aspects of Indian life cannot be replaced with English words—such relationships do not exist in European-American culture. If we wish to preserve Indian cultures, we must preserve and use the languages that support those cultures.

Current research strongly suggests that being able to speak more than one language helps boost cognitive development. New policies in some areas may help students take advantage of their ability to speak two languages and to reverse the decline of Native language use. One example is the policy enacted by the Alaska Department of Education. It encourages schools to teach and use the Alaska Native language of the local community to the extent desired by the parents of that community. In the past, Alaska Native parents thought their children's success in school would be handicapped by having a Native language as the first language. These parents likely will begin to use their Native language much more freely with their children as they learn that bilingual ability is a plus, not a minus. On October 30, 1990, President Bush signed Public Law 101-477. Title I of that bill is the Native American Language Act. This act preserves, protects, and promotes the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice, and develop Native American languages. Among other things, it recognizes the right of Natives to use their languages as a medium of instruction. The act supports according the same academic credit for proficiency in Native American language as one would receive for comparable proficiency in a foreign language, and to treat Native American languages similarly in the curriculum.

Communities must be the educators. They were in the past; they can be today. When communities do the educating, they express their values and beliefs, speak their languages, sing their songs, and tell their histories. Every local community should involve residents in designing a curriculum that reflects the community's culture. Local education agencies that don't address community needs become active participants in the destructive deterioration of *all* children, regardless of race.

Educators can learn from Native program success stories. Hualapai tribal students of Peach Springs, Arizona, complete cultural, linguistic and environmental studies through interaction with their community. A bilingual program and the content of the units taught reflects the values of the Native American community there. That is, the

science, math, and language the students learn relate to the environment and life experiences of the Hualapai reservation.

At Isleta Pueblo, Ted Jojola's computer program helps Head Start students learn the language and sacred traditions of their forebears. The program teaches non-Isletans as well. The Zuni Literacy Projects use filmstrip-like storybooks to tell stories in Zuni. People there are also compiling a Zuni/English dictionary. Others have adapted Macintosh computer programs to teach Native language (Acoma and San Juan Pueblos in New Mexico). The Red Lake Chippewa tribe in Minnesota has developed the only comprehensive code for education—an excellent example of tribal autonomy in education.

These and several other successes can reverse ethnocentric schooling and make education responsive to Native students' needs. Moreover, communities can take the following actions:

- Begin a program of curriculum revision with the assistance of eminent persons. Include Elders, tribal leaders, historians, educators, parents, and students.

- Encourage tribal education codes to ensure autonomy and leadership in education. Encourage partnerships for change. Native governments need to interface with local education agencies, state education agencies, and federal programs that affect Native students.

- Require boards of education to develop policies and plans of action to ensure that local outcomes are consistent with national and state goals.

- Initiate a major textbook review commission. Ensure that all tribes in the nation are represented. Involve tribal Elders, historians, authors, educators, parents, and students.

- Encourage publishers to produce textbooks, software, and other materials that reflect cultural and linguistic diversity.

- Assist school districts in selecting materials that are authentic, non-stereotypical, tribal specific, and free of cultural bias.

- Ensure that no school districts or teams have mascots or team names that are derogatory to any ethnic group.

- Require that teacher education programs in the state prepare teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse populations. Coordinate efforts with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE).

- Assist school districts and institutions of higher learning to recruit and retain more diverse faculty and staff.

- Offer Native language instruction from preschool through higher education and adult education. Work to get quality Native language instructors through alternative certification.

- Mandate the teaching of Native history at all levels. Assist educators in integrating information about Native people into the regular core curriculum taught to all children throughout the year. Prohibit stereotypical representations of Thanksgiving and Indian Day or week activities.

- Encourage Elders and other eminent persons to serve as faculty, with a respectable pay scale.

- Encourage intergenerational learning experiences at every opportunity. Set up mentoring with eminent persons.

- Incorporate traditional wisdom into meaningful learning experiences.

- Enable all students to serve Elders, younger children, their parents, and communities.

- Empower students to become true stewards of Mother Earth, to learn about ecology, conservation, and the interrelationship of all things.

In conclusion, it is imperative that educators and parents recognize the value of a child's language and culture. Educators must learn how to respectfully incorporate learning within a Native context, and how to incorporate the Native context within the learning structure. Most American Indian and Alaska Native children are forced to grow up

experiencing two different, and usually conflicting, views of the world. Educators must come to understand the difficult and often traumatic cultural and linguistic conflicts that Native students undergo as they attend schools of the dominant society. Because of the incongruity of the conflicting cultures, educators often fail to address children's needs adequately or appropriately. This commonly results in children suffering from insecurity, ambiguity, and alienation. Alienation leads to failure, anger, hopelessness, confusion, and often to dropping out of school altogether.

Native children need a meaningful curriculum for their present lives and future goals. They need curricula that reflect their ancient and dynamic contemporary cultures and their diverse languages. The educational experiences of students will lead to empowerment or disablement, depending on the attitudes of the educators, parents, and communities. Much also hinges on the institutional characteristics of the schools, which include:

1. how well educators incorporate culture and language into regular instruction,

2. the level of participation and influence exerted by the community in a collaborative effort to educate children, and

3. how genuinely the pedagogy incorporates students' backgrounds and experiences into the school program.

To meet adequately the educational needs of Native students, we must quickly establish a National Native Curriculum Project, funded by the U.S. Department of Education as an entitlement based on treaty rights (like all educational programs for Natives). The need is clear. All students, not just students in Native communities, stand to benefit by creating more accurate learning experiences related to the American Indian and Alaska Native.

This National Native Curriculum Project should have a central office, director, and staff of Native curriculum developers, with years of experience in Native communities and education. Regional offices also should be established in each identified culture area to develop locally researched Native curricula that accurately reflect the lifeways of the people. The results should be materials that are tribal-specific, nonstereotypical, authentic, and free of cultural bias. Two-

way communication should exist between the regional centers and the national center. This should encourage the generous contribution of all tribal groups to a nationwide effort for Native children. These curricula and resource materials must be placed in every school in the United States. In schools, they would serve as an accurate resource to bring Native children honor and to ensure that even the children "seven generations to come" may benefit from knowing about their heritage.

—Summary by Dawn Miller

References

Board of Indian Commissioners. (1880). *Eleventh annual report for 1879.* Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

SUMMARY OF PAPER 11.

Strategic Plans for Use of Modern Technology in the Education of American Indian and Alaska Native Students

Paul K. Berg and Jason Ohler

American schools are 19th-century, Industrial Revolution-era inventions, but the same technology used to spur industrial growth has worked to the detriment of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Schools were created along with industries, organized like industries, to train workers for an industrial society. The resultant large, low-context, industrial schools institutionally discriminate against Native students.

The American education model is also one based on reductionist scientific tenets established in the 18th century, which only label as "valid" information that is observable, quantifiable, and replicable. This dogma has imposed limitations, ignoring such ancient practices as acupuncture. Western science is a myth like any other and is antagonistic to Native students. The education system to which it gave rise has been disastrous for Native American students.

Industrial-age education standardizes people like factories standardize products. This process denies the cultural rights of Native people. But a new educational paradigm—a new way of viewing reality—is on the horizon. Although it is impossible to predict exactly what shape it will finally take, Native students probably will be better off with the new system. New tools, such as area computer networks, computer information systems, and multimedia have the potential to change schools.

New tools have been slower at transforming schools than other industries, partially because teachers are not trained in these systems. Schools also tend to resist change. When new technology is used, it is

usually as a new version of an old technique, such as computerized quizzes or worksheets. Development in education technology also has progressed more slowly than in other industries.

Schools are adopting some revolutionary new tools. Some school systems have established local area computer networks. By linking several microcomputers with a central computer that controls software and data flow, teachers can reduce the amount of disk storage space needed and the time spent loading and reloading programs. This also reduces the expense of buying numerous copies of software, provides rapid student access to encyclopedia, dictionary references, maps, images, important facts, and important literary works

Some schools have found computer-managed instruction useful. Students have access to a central database of separate, sequenced skill mastery tasks and testing forms. Charleston, Villagomez, and Shaffer (1989) have established criteria to help educators evaluate instructional software for Native student use. Some educators have found that multimedia activities involving computers, text, sound, and visual information also help students learn.

Large-scale computer information systems help school officials track and evaluate large amounts of student data; such systems potentially could play a role in transforming Native education. One Chippewa-Cree tribal member and researcher believes using computers can resolve the chronic problem of undersampling Native American students.

At the village school of Kwethluk, educators started a pilot project during the 1989-90 school year to improve reading and math skills among students in grades two through eight. Students used 20 microcomputers linked to an interactive network, mice, color graphics, and calculators to learn and practice their skills. After the first year, the principal saw a mild increase in attendance, a 24 percent decrease in disciplinary referrals, a substantial increase in grade school reading skills, and a dramatic increase in math scores.

Distance education holds much promise for isolated Native populations. Distance education includes: correspondence education (exchanging files), computer networking (leaving and receiving messages from multiple others), radio, audio conferencing, TV (one-way and two-way), audio graphics, phone line technologies, and at home/stand-alone technologies. However, Natives need to seek out available and emerging technology and demand that educators receive training in its use to solve educational needs.

Conclusions

People worldwide are using computers and related technologies to maintain language and culture. Natives have been slow to benefit from the power of technology. However, we see evidence that this is beginning to change.

As part of the research, the authors contacted people from every major region of the United States. As they traveled via electronic mail, phone or mail, they came across indications that Native educators, organizations, and tribes are beginning to turn to technology to help meet challenges and solve problems.

The authors identified six basic reasons why Native groups are turning to technology-assisted solutions to address educational problems:

1. To gain skills to compete in mainstream culture.

2. To maintain traditional knowledge and/or blend it with a contemporary understanding of the world to create new knowledge.

3. To discover and strengthen Native identity within the tribe and within the broader world of Native culture.

4. To organize as a Native community, sometimes across tribal lines and over great geographical distance, in order to:
   a. provide more culturally relevant and informed education,
   b. share news and information relevant to Native concerns, and
   c. organize politically.

5. To share Native culture as an educational or artistic product.

6. To teach non-Natives about Native culture.

It comes as no surprise that the use of technology is increasing among Native educators and political leaders. Natives are a technological people. The technology of the Eskimo kayak is unsurpassed. Corn and potatoes, which are products of generations of selective planting by Native farmers, feed the world. Natives have also adopted technology as needed. The iron pot and trade goods contributed to the flowering of the Great Plains cultures during the 18th and 19th centuries.

Native education is at a turning point. The American education system, based on industrial technology, has inadequately served Native students. Computers and related technologies are creating a window of opportunity for Natives to seize the initiative. There is no one best way to use educational technology to improve the quality of Native education. The power of the technology rests in its varied capabilities to expand the learning experiences of students.

Technology can increase the depth and breadth of the educational experience and make Native culture accessible to students within a redefined school environment. If Native people seize the technological initiative, Native education can experience a new age of excellence.

The transformation that the authors perceive is not inevitable. In the absence of organized and concerted efforts to direct educational change, information-age technologies may be used to promote the outdated assumptions, curricula, and methodologies of industrial schooling. Native direction of the development and implementation of educational technology is essential.

Underlying the transformation of education is a redefinition of freedom to include the cultural rights of Native people. No individual, agency, education system, or government has the authority to deny Native people the right to live according to their own cultural direction. Technology can be a powerful tool to help ensure this freedom.

Recommendations

A window of opportunity exists. Natives must seize the technological initiative to advance the cause of cultural rights and Native education. The authors recommend the following to achieve these goals:

1. Native parents should form parent advocacy groups to advocate access to cultural resources for Native students. School systems serving Native students should be encouraged to make use of educational technology, especially multimedia, to provide access to Native cultural resources.

2. School systems serving Native students should integrate computer training within the context of the total school curriculum. Students should actively use computers and related technologies as tools for exploring and creating.

3. Natives should take the lead in teaching non-Natives about Native culture. A potential area of development lies in Native-created courseware for non-Native and Native communities via distance delivery means. Native educators should influence publishers to include the Native perspective in textbooks. At the University of Calgary, an effort is underway to rewrite science books to include a more holistic perspective of indigenous cultures. Television, computer software, laserdisc, and distance delivery are means of sharing the Native cultural perspective with non-Natives.

4. Native organizations, school systems serving Native students, state departments of education, and the federal government should make a concerted effort to develop culturally relevant software for Native students. There is a lack of culture-based instructional material available for computers and multimedia instructional systems. Consideration should be given to developing materials for specific Native tribes and nations.

5. Natives should make increased use of computer networking as a vehicle for organizing as a social and political voice and share information among the geographically dispersed Native community. Computer networking can be a powerful tool for organizing to influence the politics of education.

6. Native organizations, in partnership with the federal government, should establish a National Native Education Institute. The Institute should include research, materials development, and training staff to provide the following services to educational institutions that serve Native students:

   a. Conduct research and identify effective educational strategies for Native students. Particular attention would be paid to educational strategies that involve the use of computers and related technologies.

   b. Develop instructional materials—print, computer software, and video format.

   c. Provide training and training materials to educational institutions that serve Native students.

   d. Disseminate information to focus national attention on the educational needs of Native students.

e. Establish a national Native Education Computer Network to serve as a communication link and information source for educators and students.

The creation of a national institute requires a national commitment at the policymaking level. This level of commitment is necessary to achieve results.

—Summary by Dawn Miller

References

Charleston, G. M., Villagomez, L., & Shaffer, L. B. (1989). *A project to design an evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of computer-assisted instructional packages used in the remediation of basic skills.* State College, PA: Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy, The Pennsylvania State University, for the National Commission for Employment Policy, Washington, DC (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321 008)

SUMMARY OF PAPER 12.

Reading and Language Arts Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indians and Alaska Natives

Gerald L. ("Jerry") Brown

Theories differ on how people acquire first and second languages. "Behaviorist" and "innate" theories have differential power to explain the processes. Consider the difference between language learning and language acquisition, for example.

Language *learning* is usually what goes on in a classroom. It involves rigid academic rules, grammar, structure, and repeated practice. It is done consciously, emphasizing a behaviorist approach.

Language *acquisition* is what small children do when they learn their Native language from parents, family, and friends. Without giving a thought to nouns, verbs, and other rules of grammar, children do, through repeated exposure to language, figure out how first to understand, then to speak it. Later they are taught to read and write, based on what they already know. Acquisition of language assumes innate capacity that merely needs refinement.

Native students enter school with various levels of skill in English, which provides the bridge from the known to the unknown. By respecting Native language and incorporating it into the instruction, reading teachers can increase the chance for success of Native American students.

Research suggests people learn a new language best if the process is similar to the process they went through the first time—if they acquire language by being around it. This comprehension approach involves large amounts of listening and few nonverbal responses from students first. The learning atmosphere must be nonstressful and relaxed. It is not taught through drills and forced imitation. Instead,

classes use interesting interactions, such as simple commands, to build students' understanding of the language.

Other approaches, such as the communicative learning approach, are similar, but stress different activities. The communicative approach, for example, stresses acquiring competence in authentic situations that involve the language and the students. The holistic (integrated) approach holds that students learn language best in environments where multiple supportive conditions are present. In the holistic approach, teachers do not dissect the language into component skills to be learned separately through drill and practice. Instead, students infer rules and grammar as part of a broader process of meaning-making.

The natural approach recognizes that students of any age understand language before they can reproduce it. Students will reproduce words when they are ready. When they do, classes should encourage a wide "threshold of error." That is, if a student responds, "Boy play dog," the teacher can encourage the student and serve as a good model by saying "Yes, the boy is playing with the dog." The teacher in this way avoids demanding perfect grammar too soon. The natural approach curriculum emphasizes the goal of communication in which language is merely a tool to help reach it.

Because Native American students need to develop academic competence to cope with the mainstream curriculum, some educators support content-based second-language instructional approaches. This technique uses academic-related material to teach students the language. In this way, they learn the language and academic content simultaneously.

Some students speak "reservation English," using English words, but tribal language grammar. In other cases, students recognize words, but not more complex meanings or the significance of given words. Instructional approaches need to focus on comprehension rather than on "correcting errors."

A good way to engage young readers in practicing their literary skills is to help them produce reading material from their spoken discourse. Called the language experience approach, this method involves the student's experiences. Students, for example, conduct a science experiment or take a trip, then write a story about it. By using their stories as reading material for the class, the teacher ensures two things. The students (1) study material at their current lexical and syntactic levels and (2) the content schema of the materials matches the schema of the student.

Educators can adapt basal reading materials, usually aimed at average native English-speaking populations, to a Native student's use. Still, the teacher must make sure the students are familiar with all the ideas and objects covered in the story before the students begin to read.

A greater appreciation for children's processing abilities has emerged during the last 20 years. This new understanding supports the notion that children can learn to read quite naturally if instructional procedures are in keeping with their natural linguistic competencies and abilities. The term "whole language" describes reading programs built on this body of knowledge that has come out of the work of educators, cognitive psychologists, and psycholinguists. Their studies suggest that reading is not simply a compilation of skills to be "poured" into learners' minds for their conscious learning. Instead, learning to read occurs implicitly, as a "skill" of processing whole language. Whole language proponents believe that reading and writing are learned by reading and writing. Furthermore, practice in these areas cannot be artificial or contrived. It must be bonded to what the students bring with them into the classroom and directed at what matters to them beyond the school walls.

Teachers working within the whole language instructional model view reading as a developmental process: learners grow through similar stages, but not at the same rate and not in the same way. As learners grow, it is important that teachers immerse students in a language-rich environment. This environment must be rich in exposure to written and oral language so that students become familiar with both the forms and functions of written language.

What Are the Needs of the Native Students?

There are, despite the differences among Native students, some uniform needs that classroom teachers, no matter what the content area, should know:

- The cultural heritage of the Native student needs to be recognized as an asset to the class. The various ethnic and cultural groups represented in the classroom provide many resources that can be used to enhance classroom learning for all students.

- Native students needs warm, accepting environments that allow them to become risk-takers in learning new skills or content areas.

- Individual students may need to have a "silent period." These are periods during which they listen to a great deal of language in order to get a feel for the new sounds and vocabulary that have meaning for that particular content area.

- Some Native students may need appropriate ESL instruction, depending on their level of English language proficiency. Such instruction should include both interpersonal communicative language skills and cognitive academic language skills. While second-language learners (including "reservation-English" and "village-English" speakers) can become proficient in interpersonal communication within two years, becoming proficient in cognitive academic language skills requires from five to seven years.

- Content material should include concepts appropriate for Native students' grade and achievement levels.

- Abstract content information and concepts must be made clear.

- Instructional programs in the content areas should incorporate the use of concrete materials, shared experiences, and prior knowledge.

- Native students with limited English proficiency (LEP) may need special consideration in making daily assignments and in testing. The language demands in such situations may pose barriers to success and may require modification. Because Native LEP students may have difficulty using English as a medium of thought, they may need more time to complete assignments and tests. If educators are not careful about this, their assessments of assignments and tests may reflect students' English proficiency instead of their understanding of the content.

How can the teacher plan for Native student needs?

The teacher can:

- create a positive, welcoming classroom environment;

- consider both immediate and long-term needs of the Native student;

- reduce the language complexity to a level suited to current student capabilities;
- provide contextual clues;
- provide for peer interaction and positive learning experiences;
- adapt content and concept to current Native skill levels;
- incorporate frequent comprehension checks;
- use individual preview and review;
- provide alternative instruction; and
- make texts comprehensible through supplements.

Conclusion

By understanding and carrying out successful methods for teaching language skills, schools for Natives can improve Native students' ability to communicate and learn.

—Summary by Dawn Miller

SUMMARY OF PAPER 13.

Mathematics and Science Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Education for American Indian and Alaska Native Students

Vera Preston

Issues of how mathematics and science education can be improved encompass the Native population along with the general population. In addition, some needed improvements are specific to teaching Native students.

Fundamental change is needed in the way educators teach mathematics and science. Research shows Native students are most successful at tasks that use visual and spatial abilities. They seem to be best at simultaneous processing—seeing the whole picture. They do not use successive processing—processing information sequentially and in an analytical manner—quite as much or as well. Instruction should build on Native students' strengths, using visual, spatial, and perceptual information.

Students who use hands-on materials, otherwise known as manipulatives, have better attitudes toward mathematics and a better ability to problem solve. Mathematics anxiety is almost nonexistent in classes where manipulatives are used frequently.

Another way to learn effectively is through cooperative learning. Because people work cooperatively in most situations outside school, students should have the opportunity to work together in school. Mathematicians and scientists talk to each other, try new ideas and check each other's reasoning. They do not work in total isolation. Cooperative learning works especially well with many Native students since it is common in traditional Native culture. This form of instruction seems to reduce mathematics anxiety, too.

American Indians and Alaska Natives have traditionally used

storytelling to instruct their children. Students enjoy making up story problems when the teacher provides an encouraging, accepting, respectful atmosphere in the classroom. Elements in contemporary Native experience, such as figuring out the amount of flour used in making fry bread, enhance students interests.

Many students develop math anxiety during elementary or secondary school. Bad experiences in a classroom with a teacher or a parent make some students fall behind. Acknowledging math anxiety and suggesting ways of overcoming it helps students.

Career days held at the elementary, middle, and high school levels show students the uses of mathematics in the real world. Native students should be encouraged to consider careers in fields that will help their communities.

Teachers need to learn to stimulate Native children's natural curiosity about their immediate environment. A one-day workshop is not sufficient to teach these methods. Teachers need summer school classes or other more extensive inservice training. Many exemplary schools, programs, and projects exist that can show the way to better mathematics and science instruction. Two of these are described below.

One of the major goals of summer math camps held in Colorado for Native students is to develop positive attitudes toward mathematics. Students seem to make good progress during this camp, held at the Colorado School of Mines in Golden. Activities emphasize patterns, logical thinking, and spatial relations. Hands-on, manipulative activities are used extensively. Students use pattern blocks to make designs, which they then duplicate using computers. Native parents claim that camp-goers have improved attitudes, achievements, and better self-concepts.

Mathematics and science teachers attended two eight-week seminars presented jointly by the University of Kansas, Haskell Indian Junior College, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The National Science Foundation will continue to fund these summer institutes through the summer of 1993. Teachers learned a variety of methods, most of them hands-on, that were developed with Native students in mind. Teachers gained skills in building culturally relevant curriculum objectives, materials, and teaching techniques, and in using positive role models from the community in instruction.

Recommendations

Mathematics is a "critical filter" that provides opportunities to

pursue interests in many different fields of study. Native students must receive a solid foundation in mathematics in order to have options available to them. The following recommendations all pertain to good science and mathematics instruction:

- Teach experientially, using hands-on materials.
- Have students work together in cooperative learning groups.
- Instruct students in the use of current technology.
- Use culturally relevant materials.
- Establish a national clearinghouse or computer network to assist teachers and parents in finding good materials.
- Use the NCTM standards to set specific goals for student mathematics learning.
- Do not track Native students into vocational or general curricula in ways that prevent them from pursuing college educations.
- Expect Native children to succeed and express this expectation to students, parents, teachers, and administrators.
- Encourage and sponsor students to attend summer programs.
- Provide career information to students and parents.
- Identify gifted Native students early and provide the programming they need to reach their full potential.
- Make sure all teachers receive training in Native culture and learning strategies, especially those who are new to the system.
- Make sure Native parents, grandparents, and relatives motivate their children to finish school.

The federal government must maintain the national commitment made to the Native people. Improving the current situation will require the commitment of time and money for:

- making salaries for teachers and administrators competitive,
- providing training in effective teaching methods for Native children,
- developing and disseminating culturally relevant materials and curricula, and
- improving existing facilities.

Action is required immediately.

—Summary by Mary Wade Burnside

SUMMARY OF PAPER 14.

History and Social Studies Curricula in Elementary and Secondary Schools

Karen Harvey

No area of the curriculum is so ambiguous, confusing, controversial, and value-laden as social studies. Scholars, school administrators and parents generally disagree on the definition, goals, purpose, content, scope, and sequence of history and social science education. This curricular confusion has produced students who do poorly in social studies on standardized achievement tests.

Despite these factors, it is readily apparent that the goal of self-determination demands that Native students get certain knowledge and skills from history, geography, social science, and the humanities. Specific values and experiences that will help these students become self-directing and self-sufficient should be embedded in social studies.

This paper reviews the research and literature in the fields of history and social studies education. It proposes new directions and an integrated, multifaceted approach to help Native students achieve excellence in social studies.

Defining What Social Studies Includes

The National Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools, established in 1985, states that social studies includes: . . . history, geography, government and civics, economics, anthropology, sociology and psychology, and subject matter drawn from the humanities . . ."

Other useful definitions help in clarifying the curriculum area to be addressed. Social studies includes global education and multicultu-

ral education. Many think these two characteristics are synonymous. They are not. The goals of global education include valuing diversity, making connections, and critical thinking, but also focusing on universal human values and global issues. Margaret Gibson has defined multicultural education as "a process whereby a person develops competencies in multiple systems of standards for perceiving, evaluating, behaving, and doing." This definition recognizes diversity among ethnic groups. Finally, ethnic and cultural studies comprise a third focus.

The first challenge is to figure out what is to be taught. Current textbooks used by Native students are frequently inaccurate, insensitive, and racist. Often, they are based on the unacceptable assumption that European settlers and the United States government had a moral and legal right to dominate a people and a land. An appropriate curriculum would not only strive for historical accuracy, but it would also honor, not demean, the lifeways, traditions, and accomplishments of Native people.

The second challenge is how history and social studies are taught. Students must learn the skills and dispositions to be active, involved, informed, reasonable, and courageous citizens. Linda Skinner stated, "We need Indian education to mean using the best of the old and new to educate our people whose histories, cultures, belief systems, and languages are different from the majority" (Indian Nations At Risk, 1990).

The third challenge is related to students—to whom should we teach this restructured and relevant curriculum? At the Plains Regional Public Hearing of the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force, Rennard Strickland said our nation needs to discover that which is good in all of us. Thus, study of Native history and culture should be required both for Native and non-Native students. These challenges require fundamental reform in curriculum, instructional materials, and teaching strategies.

Even when school systems attempt to include cultural curriculum in textbooks, problems can occur. Diane Ravitch recently said, "The real issue on campus and in the classroom is not whether there will be multiculturalism, but what kind of multiculturalism will there be?" (Viadero, 1990).

One school of thought proposes an ethnocentric curriculum that tells the story of history through the eyes of a particular ethnic group. The basic assumption that underlies this approach is that academic

achievement will improve as students gain more self-esteem through studying their ethnicity.

Another school of thought states the curriculum should stress the commonalities of many peoples, as well as their differences.

An integrative model would provide both a multicultural education and reform in social studies curriculum for Native students. This model incorporates the recognition that the history of Native people is the history of this land and country.

Roberta Woolever and Kathryn Scott (1988) have summarized the major purposes of social studies education in the following manner, stressing that each view holds that the central purpose of social studies education is to develop good citizens. The difference, of course, is in how a good citizen is defined:

- **Social studies as citizen transmission**. The American cultural heritage is passed onto the next generation, which is expected to maintain that tradition.

- **Social studies as personal development**. By helping students reach their full human potential, society as a whole will improve over time.

- **Social studies as reflective inquiry**. By developing critical and reflective thinking skills, students will be able to ask penetrating questions, deal with controversy, and make reasoned evaluations.

- **Social studies as social science education**. By learning a canon of content in anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, and sociology, students gain an understanding of culture, history, institutions, and human behavior.

- **Social studies as rational decisionmaking and social action**. Knowledge gained through social science inquiry helps students clarify and identify personal and social values that will be integral to later participation and action as citizens.

This last purpose has great significance for Native education, for it extends the idea of citizen action to action that challenges social structural inequality and promotes cultural diversity. Students who have this type of education are likely to deal effectively and responsi-

bly with issues facing Native people. Some of those issues include preserving Native lands, restoring fishing and hunting rights, protecting archeological sites, and conquering substance abuse.

Committees and commissions should be created to carry out these stated goals. A commission (Native National Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools) should be established to provide leadership and consultive services to textbook publishers. A national committee (National Native Studies Curriculum Committee) must be developed to provide a working model for tribal groups and communities to carry out in schools. Finally, a national resource center (National Native Curriculum Clearinghouse) must be established to provide a clearinghouse for curriculum materials and to advance appropriate social studies curricula.

Funds must be obtained so Native educators have access to emerging research related to Native curriculum. Also, Native educators must make connections to existing professional organizations.

Outcomes for History and Social Studies Education

The recommended outcomes for history and social studies education include the following components: (1) knowledge, (2) skills, (3) experiences, (4) values, and (5) dispositions.

Two demands must be reconciled: the need for a common curriculum and the need for a unique curriculum for Natives. For example, the Navajo canon of knowledge incorporates the four directions that correspond to (1) value of one's strength, (2) ability to provide for oneself, (3) ability to get along with others, and (4) one's relationship with the environment.

A useful way of looking at knowledge and outcomes in curriculum is to distinguish between the mastery curriculum and the organic curriculum (Glatthorn, 1987). Mastery curriculum meets two criteria: it is essential for all students, and it requires careful structuring. The objectives are easily measured. In the organic curriculum, the objectives do not lend themselves to focused teaching and careful measuring.

Concepts and generalizations help students organize and make sense of their world. They are basic components of higher level thinking. Native students need to master the canon of social studies concepts and generalizations that form the belief system of the larger society. Since it is a rational canon, it requires careful, sequential structuring. But Native students need to learn an organic curriculum

as well that incorporates attitudes, values, appreciations, and dispositions—the content of which comes from the Native belief system. This organic curriculum becomes known more as the process of experiential perceptions—hence "organic"—neither sequenced nor carefully bounded.

Schools should provide experiences that provide models and build skills, self-confidence, and belief in the power of individuals and groups to contribute to the common good. But knowledge, skills, and experiences are not enough. Desire and the inclination to make a difference as shown through such qualities as persistence, responsibility, commitment, ingenuity, and sensitivity are required. Social studies content must be selected carefully to promote these aims.

Schools must plan for a comprehensive K-12 progression or a scope and sequence of curriculum. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) in 1984 stated: "It is not possible to present a scope and sequence that would be appropriate for the many communities that comprise such a large and diverse nation as the United States."

The members suggested topics for the grades K-5 curriculum could be easily modified by local school districts. Still, the NCSS raises concerns about the ease with which the curriculum can be modified for grades 6-12. Effective teaching for those grades depends heavily on textbooks, available instructional materials, and teacher knowledge. The problem of how to incorporate the organic curriculum remains.

Improvement of Pedagogy

This part discusses the improvement of pedagogy—the instructional component that is the delivery system for the curriculum. Classroom environment is important. Is the classroom warm, friendly, and inviting? Does it project the sense that good people do important work here? Ideally, for Native students, classrooms should reflect the family structure with an ungraded and multigenerational organization that includes parents and Elders.

The learning styles of some Natives students may differ from those of most students. Some Native students show strengths in using visual, perceptual, or spatial information as opposed to information presented verbally. Also, Native students need to engage in learning things related to evolving interests and needs. Many Native students also frequently use mental images rather than word associations. Educators need to use teaching strategies aimed at such students. But

differences in acculturation among Natives may make no one strategy completely effective.

Students need to be evaluated fairly and in ways that will help them. Educators must exercise caution in using results from standardized achievement tests, many of which may be culturally biased, especially for rural and reservation Native students. Evaluation must inform teaching and be geared toward the empowerment of students. This implies legitimacy for a broad range of evaluation strategies. Plus, students need to learn how to take tests.

Recommendations

Teacher programs should help teachers be aware of the lifeways and world views of Native people. This awareness can best be gained by personal and professional contact with Native people.

Authoritarian, rigid teachers who are unwilling to adapt their instruction to Native student characteristics need to be replaced.

Teachers need to develop multiple teaching strategies through repeated practice, peer coaching, and continuing administrative support to sustain change efforts.

Curriculum builders need to devise fair and appropriate evaluation strategies.

Such a social studies curriculum might well incorporate the National Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools (1988) offering that has been extended and modified to include elements relevant for Native students.

—Summary by Mary Wade Burnside

References

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force. (1990) *Indian Nations At Risk—Plains Regional Public Hearing Report*. Washington, D.C.: Indian Nations At Risk Task Force of the U. S. Department of Education. p. 78. (See last chapter of this volume for Indian Nations At Risk publications ordering information.)

Viadero, D. (1990). Battle over multicultural education rises in intensity. *Education Week 10*(13), pp. 1, 11-13.

Woolever, R., & Scott, K. P. (1988). *Active learning in social studies: Promoting cognitive and social growth*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

SUMMARY OF PAPER 15.

Gifted and Talented American Indian and Alaska Native Students

Stuart Tonemah

From earliest memory, tribal people relied for survival and prosperity upon individuals who were visionary and exemplary in the way they conducted their lives. These people were identified early in their lives, taught and nurtured by parents, mentors, and the tribe as a whole. These gifted and talented Natives eventually became mentor-teachers to the next generation. In this way, tribes passed on wisdom and strength.

By contrast, the U. S. government did not regard the unique capabilities of Native students as important. Educators wanted to assimilate Native students into mainstream American culture. Native people resisted forced assimilation policies by refusing to send their children to the federal boarding schools that offered such an education. In response, the federal government withheld goods from Indian families.

As early as 1928, the Meriam report recommended a change in thinking regarding the education of Native people. Another report in 1968, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge,* found Native students to be at the lowest extreme of educational and socioeconomic strata.

What has happened to those tribal members with high ability and outstanding leadership ability? They have been ignored and forgotten. The American notion of equality in education pushes all toward a middle standard of mediocrity. To be different—to be Native and gifted—was, and is, difficult.

Public school efforts to educate Native students still focus on remedial efforts. Native students, in fact, do not participate in gifted

programs in proportion to the level of participation among their non-Native peers. Some of the reasons for this circumstance are physical and social isolation, lack of parental involvement in education, and a lack of Native teachers as role models. As a result, observers have a limited understanding of "what could be."

Native students do not fare well when they are assessed for gifted behavior. Even if bright Native students can overcome the assessment barriers, the problems of being a minority (and therefore "at risk") in American society must still be resolved.

Racial and ethnic biases permeate assessment procedures. The premise of gifted education (from the 1990 draft definition of the National Steering Committee Report of Gifted Education) that gifted students exist "in all cultural groups across all economic strata, and in all areas of human endeavor" has still not been fully accepted.

However prevalent it continues to be, the assumption that any one test adequately represents a student's ability has been discredited. Standardized, norm-referenced tests developed by commercial test makers were intended to serve large urban school districts and to reflect urban life experiences. When assessing Native students, educators should consider other criteria.

A multicultural approach to assessment is more likely to identify gifted Native students. Among proposed criteria for multicultural assessment, the literature on gifted students prominently mentions the following:

- soliciting nominations from people other than teachers,
- using checklists designed specifically for culturally diverse and disadvantaged populations,
- developing culture-specific identification systems,
- using culture-specific quota systems,
- developing programs that eliminate experiential and language deficits prior to assessment, and
- applying matrix systems to weight multiple criteria.

Unique tribal characteristics and cultural values make the interests of Native students different from those of non-Natives. In 1985,

American Indian Research and Development, Inc. (AIRD), surveyed 266 Native educators to determine the criteria considered important when educating Native students. Four categories evolved from the content analysis of responses: (1) acquired skills, such as problem solving and language ability; (2) tribal and cultural understanding, such as knowledge of ceremonies and traditions and respect for Elders; (3) human qualities, such as intelligence and humor; and (4) aesthetic abilities, such as creative expression.

A 1989 study of minority gifted students, *No Gifts Wasted* (Alamprese, Erianger, & Brigham), reports that economically disadvantaged minority children constitute 30 percent of public school enrollment but compose less than 20 percent of the students selected for gifted programs. A few programs have been developed to provide gifted education to Native students. Some functioned for several years, but then disappeared, due to a loss of funding or absorption into the regular school functions.

The scarcity of Native gifted programs makes effectiveness of the programs that do exist critical. To ensure that a program is effective, the Native community needs to be directly involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the program, as well as in developing its philosophy.

It is equally important to address the need for more Native teachers to teach this student population. Native teachers are more sensitive to and aware of the tribal cultures of the students they teach. Native teachers should also have a temperament that reflects a high degree of self-esteem, and they must have a passion for what they teach.

If tribes rely on the current educational system, a longer period of inappropriate education may occur. Parental involvement is necessary for changes to occur. The parents of gifted children need to be acquainted with the literature on gifted children. In this process, parents will come to recognize that giftedness is a positive value. As they learn to nurture the abilities of their own children, parents will expand and enhance their own abilities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered to the overall American education community or to those entities directly involved with educating American Indian and Alaska Native students:

- A massive education and public relations effort needs to be

launched to dispel stereotypic images of American Indian and Alaska Native students, particularly the gifted and talented. The image that all American Indian and Alaska Native students need remedial education must be abandoned. Educators must recognize that American Indian and Alaska Native students have capabilities in all areas of learning. This effort should be directed both to the American public and to Native peoples.

- More research needs to be conducted to develop the literature on the education of gifted and talented American Indians and Alaska Natives. The uniqueness of the cultures of American Indians and Alaska Natives needs to be described to determine how or if these unique features contribute to the educational development of gifted and talented students. Further research could contribute to developing more appropriate approaches to educating this student population.

- Multi-criteria approaches need to be developed and used to assess American Indian and Alaska Native students. Such approaches should be sensitive to and inclusive of tribal and cultural perspectives on giftedness. Case studies should be undertaken to develop a more accurate portrayal of American Indian and Alaska Native students' strengths with respect to identification for gifted programs.

- More programs need to be developed to prepare American Indian and Alaska Native teachers to teach in gifted programs for American Indian and Alaska Native students. Such teachers serve as role models, and they bring a sensitivity of cultures and tribes to the provision of gifted education services.

- American Indian and Alaska Native gifted academies or magnet schools should be developed to serve American Indian and Alaska Native students. Such schools would include all traditional secondary academic areas of instruction with a tribal cultural orientation. These schools could provide leadership, self-concept, and cultural heritage learning experiences to students in a positive environment.

- An intensive inservice training program needs to be developed to assist parents, teachers, and tribal educators to understand the

needs of gifted and talented American Indian and Alaska Native students.

- Funds should be provided to tribes to help high- ability, performing tribal youth complete their educations. The funds may be an incentive to these youth to return to work with their tribes.

—Summary by Mary Wade Burnside

References

Alamprese, J. A., Erianger, W. J., & Brigham, N. (1989). *No gift wasted: Effective strategies for educating highly able, disadvantaged students in mathematics and science.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education OPBE, Contract No. 300-87-0152.

SUMMARY OF PAPER 16.

American Indians and Alaska Natives With Disabilities

Marilyn J. Johnson

Providing special education services for Native children with special needs is both philosophically and pedagogically complex. Resistance, lack of awareness, and low priority have, moreover, been major setbacks in the implementation of special education services. But as Native education is evaluated, we cannot tolerate decisions for reform that ignore the needs of these children.

This paper attempts to describe the special needs of Native students. It recounts the laws protecting the rights of these children, and it describes educational efforts that are appropriate for their needs. Finally, it provides recommendations for improving special education services to Native students.

Special Needs of Native Students

Native students with special needs experience the same ineffective and inefficient services as other language minority children. Their needs have been ignored or subjugated to the lowest levels of priority. The needs are often the last to be addressed, and the services that are provided are often the first to be reduced.

Indian children who require special education services in order to access education represent nearly 17 percent of the enrollment in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and almost 10 percent of the public school enrollment.

Regardless of disability, however, these children are American Indian and Alaska Natives first—with all that such status entails, including language, culture, values, and beliefs. Their disabling condition does *not* preclude the presence of a cultural and a language

base. They need to learn and to interact appropriately within that cultural context.

Legal Rights

Legislation has had a major impact on affirming the rights of disabled persons. These laws include the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1976, the Education for All Handicapped Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142), the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1984, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 states, in part:

> No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States...shall be solely by reason of his handicap, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Key elements of P.L. 94-142 protect children from being misplaced in special education, including procedures that govern screening, referral, assessment, staffing, and placement. The law also requires parental involvement in the education of the disabled child. If a parent's primary language is not English, the parents must be informed in the language they can understand.

Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act in 1978 established American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Section 130 of the act states that the Commissioner:

> ...may make grants to the governing bodies of Indian tribes located on federal and state reservations to pay 90 percent of the costs of vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped American Indians residing on such reservations.

Disabilities and Socioeconomic Conditions

Native people experience disability at much higher rates than the U. S. population in general. This circumstance is compounded by equally disproportionate rates of poverty, poor health, and unemployment. The 1980 Census states 27.5 percent of American Indians had incomes below the poverty level, compared to 12.4 percent for the nation as a whole. These conditions amplify the effect of disabilities.

Nonetheless, educators must recognize that neither poverty nor ethnicity causes limited intelligence. Stereotypes can lead to self-fulfilling prophecies of low expectations.

According to data from the BIA and Department of Education, the

projected total number of Native children with disabilities in 1987 was 44,752. Data reveal that over half of these children were classified as learning disabled. The second and third highest placements were speech impaired and educable mentally retarded. At the same time, the BIA estimates that approximately 2,000 to 3,000 children on reservations with BIA schools needed, but were not receiving special education services.

Appropriate Assessment

Before special education services are implemented, children are referred for evaluation. During the assessment process, educators need to make sure the process is sensitive to the child's culture and that it accommodates the child's language.

These requirements are especially important when dealing with Native students. Testing materials must be selected and administered to minimize unfair racial and cultural discrimination. Testing must occur in the language in which the student is most proficient. And no single test may be used as the criterion for determining an appropriate educational program for a child.

Testing practices that affect Native students must be evaluated in light of several criticisms. Among such criticisms are the following:

- standardized tests are biased against minority groups,
- the homogeneous instructional groups so often formed on the basis of test results limit opportunities and foster undemocratic attitudes,
- evaluators sometimes fail to accommodate the languages and cultures of Native students,
- misuse of assessment data contributes to self-fulfilling prophecies about Native students,
- widespread use of standardized tests impedes educational change when it "drives the curriculum,"
- standardized tests tend to reinforce the view that human beings possess only innate capacities that are fixed at birth, and
- norm-referenced tests are not useful for instructional purposes.

In a 1979 review of 12 studies, McShane, a Native psychologist, explored the merits of three beliefs about test performances of American Indians. These beliefs were: (1) American Indian students had poor language skills and would perform poorly on the verbal scales of the Wechsler tests; (2) American Indian students were shy, and tended to be inhibited in responding verbally; and (3) American Indian students had perception skills slightly stronger than verbal skills and performed better on the performance scale of the Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children (WISC). He found support for each of these beliefs in scores of Native students deemed to be in need of special education services.

Among Native students, a number of factors create bias in test performance. These factors include the following: language skill differences, physiological factors (such as poor hearing resulting from otitis media), neurological factors (including brain hemispheric preference), and sociocultural factors. All these factors create biases in standardized, norm-referenced test performance.

Observers urge educators to exercise caution when using the Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children-Revised and the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children to help inform placement decisions for Native students. A variety of alternatives to typical psychometric approaches exist. One alternative is Academic Task Analysis; another is pluralistic assessment. (For more information, please consult the full-length Task Force paper).

An Academic Task Analysis uses criterion-referenced tests or locally developed academic tasks and skills to assess cognitive and academic potential. The point of such an analysis is to describe a child's performance in terms that are instructionally meaningful. This alternative brings assessment and program planning into closer alignment. Its use, moreover, requires a closer integration of instruction with assessment and program planning.

Pluralistic assessment organizes assessment data into normative profiles that represent ethnic or socioeconomic groups. Decisions about students are made on the basis of comparison of individual student performance to these "pluralistic" norms. Mercer's System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA) is perhaps the most familiar such system. Some inherent validity problems have caused the SOMPA to be used with caution, but this system is one widely known attempt to address the overrepresentation of minority children in special education.

Whatever the approach, sound assessment requires adequately trained evaluators. The educational fate of Native students should not be entrusted to professionals who lack interest, awareness, or knowledge of this population. Native educators and psychologists have made numerous recommendations for improving the assessment of Native students. Attending to their proposals is necessary to ensure more appropriate decisions for Native students with special needs.

Appropriate Curriculum

Educators view curriculum both as what is learned and how that learning takes place. In its present form, Native special education encompasses most of the content of the regular curriculum. Native special education students are expected to learn what their peers in regular education learn, with the proviso that their disabilities be accommodated through instructional practices that often differ from those of regular education.

Key policy issues. Issues that require closer analysis are the policy areas of bilingual education and the Regular Education Initiative (REI). Though bilingual education remains controversial in some quarters, federal law permits bilingual education for Native students with limited English proficiency as a way to provide educational opportunities comparable to the opportunities accessible to English-proficient students.

By the same token, if mainstreaming is not kept in view as a goal, students can be kept in special programs, where they may be stigmatized and suffer other negative consequences. The significant proposals of the Regular Education Initiative are intended to help integrate special needs students into regular classrooms. The Initiative may have a significant effect on the delivery of special education in the future. If trained properly, regular classroom teachers can, according to REI advocates, provide instruction to mildly handicapped students better than that provided by the current system of special education.

The ineffectiveness of pull-out programs suggests in-classroom changes to fulfill special needs. Why not Native language needs as well? Bilingual special education is a logical combination. At present, however, Native special education students are not typically considered for bilingual education support.

Curriculum areas. Early childhood programs in Native special education are critical to prevention. Nationwide policies on comprehensive child-find and preventative education are essential for Native

infants and young children. Such programs are essential in light of the prevalence of fetal alcohol and substance abuse syndromes in some Native communities.

Though the academic program duplicates the content of regular education, Native special education requires measures to address the effects of those disabilities. Native special education students can learn to read if instruction focuses on critical skills such as sight vocabulary, word analysis, and reading strategies. Native special education students must read with greater ease if they are to engage higher-order thinking as they progress through school. Good instruction in mathematics for Native special needs students requires similar focus. In particular, the use of all senses is important for these students. The use of manipulatives combined with auditory and visual cues is essential to cultivate attention and foster understanding in mathematics.

Recommendations

Recommendations come from testimony received at Task Force hearings, from the professional literature on Native special needs students, and from other sources as well. They include:

- Implement the mandate of P.L. 94-142. Existing needs outstrip the ability of existing, diminishing resources to meet them.
- Continue to include students with mild and moderate handicapping conditions among those eligible for special education services.
- Require the BIA to serve Native special needs students, preschool through second grade, on the same basis as addressed in the states' special education program.
- Encourage and empower parent and family involvement, for example, by training Native parents to exercise their rights under applicable laws.
- Address Native needs with respect to fetal alcohol and substance abuse syndromes. The educational needs of these children can be anticipated and must be addressed.
- Include provisions for assisting Native special needs students in plans for extended year schooling and networking of resources—including access to social services.

Although controversy for decades has surrounded the provision of education to minority children with special needs, American education has gradually modified its policies and practices in response to litigation and legislation. Educators have a great deal of work still to do to ensure that Native students benefit from these changes and that Native special education continues to improve.

—Summary by Mary Wade Burnside

SUMMARY OF PAPER 17.

American Indian and Alaska Native Higher Education: Toward a New Century of Academic Achievement and Cultural Integrity

Bobby Wright

Historical Context

Some of the most enduring and prestigious institutions of higher learning in this country began with the charge to serve American Indians as part of their original charters. Indeed, Caleb Cheeshateaumuck, an Algonquin, graduated from Harvard College in 1665. Within months of his graduation, however, he died of a foreign disease to which he had no immunity. His fate is symbolic of the failure of early colonial, and later federal, policy to Christianize and "civilize" Native peoples through their assimilation into white institutions.

Tribal resistance to such "civilized education" was strong, and the obvious failure of the approach of the educational missionary led George Washington to prescribe a change in emphasis from higher learning to vocational training. What he did not change was the concurrent goal of dissolving the traditional Native way of life. This latter objective was to dominate the Native educational process into the 20th century.

Early Tribal Support and Assimilation

While many tribes resisted, some Native groups embraced and encouraged higher learning as it was presented to them. In the 1830s, the Cherokees and Choctaws organized a system of higher education that had more than 200 schools; they sent numerous graduates of these schools to eastern colleges. The Choctaw tribally operated boarding schools were responsible for a literacy rate that exceeded that of

neighboring whites. In addition, many white schools had substantial Native enrollments. The Baptists founded Bacone College in 1880 and had 56 Native clergy students by 1885.

These early Native students studied the same subjects as white students. As the federal government came to dominate Native education, however, higher education gave way to vocational training. The federal industrial boarding school system, begun in 1879, was the model for the next 50 years. Its methods required the removal of the students from their homes and tribes, strict military discipline, infusion of the Protestant work ethic, and an emphasis on agricultural and domestic arts. Thus, by 1900 only a very few Natives attended colleges or universities, the figure dwindling to 385 in 1932, with only 52 college graduates identified.

The 20th Century

The New Deal of the 1930s brought government support to Native higher education. Loan programs and the post-World War II GI Bill were among the increased opportunities available for Natives, especially males. Native enrollment increased dramatically, but was still only 1 percent of the Native population by 1966. Legislation in the 1970s addressed this problem mainly through the BIA Higher Education program and the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978. The shift to more Native control of education challenged the paternalistic policies of the past with the development of new tribally controlled community colleges. Today there are 24 such institutions serving the equivalent of about 4,500 fulltime students.

Current Demographics

The dramatic growth in Native enrollment in postsecondary institutions has leveled off from its climb through the last quarter century. This trend is alarming, considering the current rapid growth in the college-age Native population. Thus, Native Americans remain among the least educated ethnic groups in this country. Only 6 percent of the Native population has a college degree, compared with 23 percent for whites. Federal agencies report low enrollments and high attrition for Natives, but simple statistical data on Natives and other minorities are often unavailable or suspect, since Natives are lumped in the "other" category in many reports and surveys, including the U. S. Census.

Most Native Americans attend public institutions as an invisible minority. However, in three federal institutions, Natives form the majority (Haskell Indian Junior College, the Institute of American Indian Arts, and the Southwest Indian Polytechnic Institute), as in the previously mentioned tribally controlled community colleges. Nonetheless, the proportion of enrolled Native students attending fulltime at colleges and universities is down, from 62 percent in 1976 to 48 percent in 1984. Although Natives currently obtain training in areas of critical need to Native communities (e.g., business education and the health professions), no data are available on the number who actually return to the reservations and Native villages.

Access, Retention, and Graduation

Natives experience certain persistent barriers that inhibit their successful Native participation. Common themes of inadequate academic preparation, insufficient financial support, very few available role models, and an unsupportive institutional climate permeate available studies.

Current strategies to improve conditions for Native students include several U. S. Department of Education programs for disadvantaged students, the SCUP (School, College, and University Partnerships) program, private training and financial aid programs, and the formation of cultural centers and support groups on campuses. Several colleges and universities—for example, Montana State University, Northern Arizona University, and Clarkson University—have noteworthy programs aimed at providing comprehensive support for Native students. Common characteristics of these programs originate in a strong, ongoing commitment, often led by one influential administrator. Collaboration with Native communities, an emphasis on precollege programs, enhanced financial services, and strong student support services also characterize successful programs.

Future Strategies

It remains to be seen if the future educational success of Native peoples will contribute to their further assimilation or to greater conformation to and validation of their cultural uniqueness. Either way, much remains to be done if the postsecondary entrance and graduation of Native students is to increase significantly. Recommendations toward a new era in American Indian education include the following:

- increased congressional appropriations for financial aid;
- collaboration between grant programs and individual higher education institutions to allow attendance at the full range of institutions;
- time-extended financial aid for those who need more time to graduate;
- establishment of educational statistics on Natives;
- recognition of needs of students from non-reservation Native communities (rural and urban);
- improvement of precollegiate preparation stressing social and emotional as well as academic readiness;
- improvement of guidance in junior and senior high schools;
- greater involvement of parents and Native communities;
- provision of cultural centers, Native studies programs, and services on campus;
- proactive affirmative action to attract more Natives to become educators; and
- increased support of tribal community colleges through collaboration of federal, state, and Native governments and higher education institutions.

Native peoples persist as unique cultures. Their persistence in the face of longstanding efforts to remold them is, in fact, astounding and commendable. They must have opportunities to gain higher education on their own terms, to benefit themselves and to benefit their communities.

—Summary by Timothy Stark

SUMMARY OF PAPER 18.

Underfunded Miracles: Tribal Colleges

Schuyler Houser

Tribal colleges are succeeding. These 24 reservation-based, postsecondary institutions attract, retain, and educate a new population of American Indian and Alaska Native students. College enrollments of Native students increased steadily throughout the 1980s.

Historically, Native people have been ambivalent about Western education. Often, that education did not teach survival skills necessary for Native students, and prejudice in the Western world left them unable to cope, even with a good education.

In 1968, the Navajo Nation became the first tribe to establish its own college by granting a charter to Navajo Community College. Three years later, the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the Rosebud Sioux Tribe chartered schools as well. These first institutions each possessed a distinct tribal and institutional identity, but shared several family resemblances. Each was established by a charter granted by a tribal council, and each college had its own Native governing board.

Mutual Support

Local control has been a premise of the tribal college movement. This control is shaping individual colleges to meet the specific educational needs of their communities.

But despite geographical and cultural separations, these schools continue to face many similar problems. In 1972, presidents from six tribal colleges met in Washington, D.C. The plans that emerged from their conversations led to the formation of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC). The consortium now includes 24 tribally controlled institutions and two affiliate members. The colleges work together on accreditation and fundraising, includ-

ing legislative advocacy. In 1988 they also organized the American Indian College Fund (AIFC), which raised $1 million in its first year of operation. The AIFC has also established its own endowment fund, assisted by a challenge grant from the MacArthur Foundation and a contribution from the Hearst Foundation.

Nontraditional students are the norm at tribal colleges. Women predominate; most institutions are two-thirds to three-fourths female, often unemployed single heads of household. The median age is 29 to 30 years old. Moreover, large numbers of students do not have high school diplomas but instead have GEDs, often earned through the tribal college programs. About 98 percent of the students qualify for need-based federal financial aid. Many students must drive 120 miles or more a day, often in bad weather, to get to and from classes. Colleges have dealt with this situation by developing their own bus services and by decentralizing—moving classes to the students—and by other innovative efforts.

Despite these hardships, students indicate they are pleased with the tribal colleges. Colleges participate in their communities on many levels, by providing educational services (such as libraries) and by joining in community activities (such as softball leagues and powwows). With tribal colleges, decisionmaking processes are consistently open to community observation, which enhances credibility and acceptance among Native people.

Tribal colleges maintain close contact, not only with individual students, but also with whole families and communities. Tribal colleges work to strengthen student academic and personal responsibility.

These colleges also vary considerably from one another on matters of curriculum, educational philosophy, and teaching styles. The diversity emerges from the institutions' commitments to serve the educational needs of their local communities. But Indian studies and language departments generally form a central part of the intellectual and spiritual life at tribal colleges. This work is not always easy—most colleges have had to prepare their own texts for language, literature, and music.

Vocational programs also are essential. Tribal colleges must compete individually for grants that support three-year vocational programs. When this money runs out, some tribal colleges have had to replace it with scarce money from alternative sources, unlike state programs, which receive regular annual federal funding. Colleges

offer vocational classes to fit the social, economic, and natural environment needs of the communities. What is appropriate and cost effective also influences how tribal colleges choose their curricula.

Because many students have been away from formal education for some time prior to enrollment, and because they typically have family responsibiities, they do not always proceed at the same pace as students at other colleges. A study of six colleges between 1983-89 reported 1,575 graduates. These graduates have been successful in finding employment: 83 to 88 percent were employed in areas that experienced from 54 to 85 percent unemployment. Tribal colleges have helped women get off federal assistance and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Many graduates have gone on to get degrees at other colleges, including Harvard Law School. Turtle Mountain Community College, for instance, reported that its graduates had earned 155 bachelor's degrees, 25 master's degrees, as well as law and doctoral degrees.

Despite these positive factors, money from the federal government has been inadequate. The Carnegie Foundation, in its 1989 report, *Tribal Colleges: Shaping the Future of Native America*, noted that federal support has not kept pace with growth or even the colleges' basic needs. In 1990, each tribal college received $2,200 per Indian Student Count, a formula devised to determine how much should be paid to these schools. By comparison, in the state of Montana, three public two-year colleges of comparable size received $4,340 for each student, $3,838 of which was in state and local funding.

Federal funds should, however, be the basic revenue source for tribal colleges, which serve some of the least affluent areas of the nation. The colleges are frugal with those funds. Fulltime faculty salaries average $19,000, compared to $30,000 at neighboring institutions. Physical facilities also need attention. Many of these colleges were started in hand-me-down buildings, some of them condemned. Maintaining these buildings can be expensive. Colleges struggle to sustain stable and adequate support, while the federal government regularly funds majority society institutions with much weaker track records in serving Native students.

Recommendations

The Carnegie Foundation report's recommendation for increased funding has been largely ignored. The report recommends that the $5,820 per student, which is already authorized by Congress, be

appropriated. Other recommendations include the following:

- The federal government needs to reexamine policies for financial aid to students. Grants—rather than loans—appear to be appropriate for such impoverished communities. Colleges should not be financially penalized for having low percentages of students who complete their programs in the time periods normally allocated.

- Federal agencies need to target tribal colleges to participate in existing programs, such as agriculture; rural economic development; science and technology education; and historical linguistic and cultural preservation.

- As the institutions become more visible and more successful, they must not be penalized for their efforts to create long-term financial stability; federal funds to match endowments must be increased.

- On the state level, state governments need to provide tribal colleges with funds to cover the cost of educating non-Native students. The colleges receive no operating funds from the federal government for these students.

- Additionally, state universities and colleges need to continue to develop collaborative relationships with tribal colleges.

- Philanthropic organizations and foundations have been slow to recognize and acknowledge the value of tribal colleges. To the recommendation of the Carnegie Foundation must be added encouragement to support the American Indian College Fund, which has established its effectiveness and reliability during its first year of operation.

- Corporate-giving policies frequently restrict donations to geographical areas in which plants or businesses are located. Corporate donors need to be encouraged to support higher education for Native students, particularly through the American Indian College Fund.

- The tribal colleges that have thrived have been able to place a perceptible distance between themselves and the turbulence of

elective tribal politics. Tribal governments need to recognize the critical nature of college autonomy.

- As resources become available, tribal colleges need to address the issue of baccalaureate level education for their students.

- The colleges, individually or in groups, need to find ways to provide their communities with access to specialized research skills, and to a core group of trained researchers familiar with tribal needs and issues.

Lessons and Implications

Tribal colleges demonstrate the efficacy of a decentralized network of institutions, responsive to local needs. They derive their strength from local accountability. Their founders insisted that the ultimate moral purposes of education at the tribal colleges be acknowledged, celebrated, and shared. They chose wisely.

—Summary by Mary Wade Burnside

SUMMARY OF PAPER 19.

American Indian and Alaska Native Adult Education and Vocational Training Programs: Historical Beginnings, Present Conditions, and Future Directions

John Hatch

A growing consensus views the success of Native adult education and vocational training programs as tied to the economic health of Native communities. The problems of illiteracy and unemployment are related and cannot be solved in isolation from one another. They are simply symptoms of the same illness—poverty. One begets the other, creating an unending cycle of despair that robs Native families, communities, and governments of their culture, traditions, and dignity.

No single agency or legislative initiative has the power to alter the situation. Reform will occur only after tribal, state, and federal efforts combine resources to stimulate Native economies and provide adequate funds for the operation of adult training and education programs. Such a multifrontal assault will improve employment opportunities, inspire Native adults to obtain employment skills, and provide Native governments and enterprises with a better educated work force. These accomplishments all will move Native communities further down the road to self-determination.

At hearings in Montana, Washington, Alaska, Minnesota, Arizona, North Carolina, and California, many have spoken with anger, frustration, and concern about the failure of Native adult and vocational education. The extent of the failure has been documented since 1923, when Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work appointed the Committee of One Hundred. That committee reported on the lack of compe-

tence of educators and the inadequacy of facilities serving Native communities.

Later, in 1969 the congressional study, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge* (also known as the Kennedy Report), echoed concerns expressed 40 years earlier. The study revealed that:

- Native dropout rates were twice the national average;
- some school districts had dropout rates approaching 100 percent;
- achievement levels of Native children were two to three years below those of white students;
- Native children fell progressively further behind, the longer they stayed in school;
- only one percent of Native children in elementary school had Native teachers; and
- Native children, more than any other minority group, believe themselves to be below average in intelligence.

The authors concluded that national policies for educating Native people were a "failure of major proportions." The result of that failure was the large number of undereducated Native adults.

The Kennedy Report influenced the development and passage of the Indian Education Act of 1972, which provides funds to school districts and to Native communities, organizations, and institutions for the development of Native-conceived and Native-controlled primary, secondary, and adult education programs. Funds to school districts for Indians are entitlement, but those to Indian groups are competitive. Such competitively awarded funds have never reached the level needed to meet the educational needs of Native communities. The Act also provides discretionary funds to public colleges and universities to train Native teachers.

The Indian Education Act was followed by the passage of the "Indian Vocational Program" contained within the reauthorization language of what became the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act (Public Law 98-524). Congressmen Albert Quie (R., Minnesota) and Michael Blouin (D., Iowa) sponsored the then one-percent setaside

program. The setaside was to be matched by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). This matching never followed; the BIA has continually and successfully obtained congressional waivers to relieve it of its matching mandate.

These reports—and others produced during the past 60 years—provide overwhelming evidence that the federal government has not fulfilled its promise to provide for the education of American Indians and Alaska Natives. Each of the reports has identified the problems facing Native adults and has made recommendations for change. Yet, clearly, little has changed. The relationship between the federal government and Native communities remains distressingly constant. The conditions within Native communities remain sadly predictable.

Reform will not occur until the government understands that the greatest need involving Native education is a change in point of view. Lewis Meriam's recommendation has been reformulated and reworded, but always repeated, by the authors of every major report since the 1920s. It was the spirit behind the Indian Reorganization Act and the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistant Act. Boldly interpreted, this spirit calls for a redirection of federal funds from federal agencies to Native governments. It conveys the historic view that Native governments be treated as sovereign nations—fully able to determine the educational direction of their members.

Current Federal Legislation and BIA Education Programs

The United States Congress has enacted an array of legislation aimed at increasing the educational and vocational opportunities afforded to adult American Indian and Alaska Natives.

The Adult Education Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act provide funds to the states to operate adult education and vocational training programs. Natives participate in these federally funded, state-administered programs by attending state-accredited high schools, adult education programs, junior colleges, and four-year universities.

Other legislation that provides direct funding to Native communities and organizations to develop their own educational programs include: the Indian Education Act, the Indian and Hawaiian Natives Vocational Education Program, the Joint Training Partnership Act, and the Family Support Act. Others supported by the BIA include adult education and adult vocational training programs.

Recommendations

The path to improving services to Native communities requires changes that are not new proposals. As of 1991, many of the recommendations suggested in the 1969 Kennedy Report have not been touched. That report itself reproved the federal government for not following recommendations in the Meriam Associates Report in 1928.

- Indian Education offices must research demographic information. The Indian Health Service, the BIA, the U. S. Department of Education, and the U. S. Census Bureau each use different methods to collect and report data, making comparisons difficult. Federal government officials are probably unaware of the problems facing Natives. Good educational and vocational information exists at the tribal level. It needs to be collected nationwide.

- The Indian Priority System does not work and needs to be changed. It was intended to enable Native input into the budget process. Native governments were to be consulted on things they valued—during the federal budget process and before the President sent the budget to Congress. Natives report that, in reality, neither BIA budgets nor Congressional allocations reflect Native priorities. Natives mistrust central offices because local governments have put thousands of dollars into programs such as higher education scholarships, only to have federal agencies reduce local budgets without warning.

- Natives need model education programs, just as the Kennedy Report advised. Funds have been available through the Indian Education Act to pilot, evaluate, and disseminate adult education programs. Native governments need a guide to adult education that includes standards to follow, funding sources, recruitment techniques, curriculum selection, teaching techniques, and evaluation methods.

- If education money is going to be awarded competitively to the communities that write the best grant proposals, then Native governments—which often cannot afford to hire grant writers—need technical assistance. These services could be provided by existing federal agencies meant to serve the needs of Native Americans.

119

- Support for Tribal Education Departments as required by the Indian Education Act has never been funded. Native communities need these offices, which centralize all education programs in one office. When adequately funded, departments are able to employ program administrators and grant writers. With funded departments, Native communities can evaluate their needs and compete for state and federal discretionary programs.

- The BIA should be required to comply with the federal law requiring the Bureau to match funds set aside by the Carl D. Perkins Adult Education and Vocational Act. Native governments have lost $100 million in vocational funding because the Bureau has evaded this responsibility.

- Each state should determine the educational needs in Native communities and develop a plan to address the problems. The plans should be used to target additional programs and funds to Native communities.

- The Indian Education Act grant formula needs to be rethought. The Act is supposed to provide public school districts with additional funding for special education programs for Native children and to include Native parents in planning. The Act has been moderately successful, but current legislation prevents Native governments from participating in the formula process. Lay parents are often intimidated by professinal educators on whom they must depend for all information about the program.

- Tribal community colleges and vocational schools should be adequately supported.

- State and federal agencies should join forces to improve the economies of Native communities. Employed graduates are the best recruiters. Unemployed graduates spread the word that educational programs are a failure.

—Summary by Dawn Miller

SUMMARY OF PAPER 20.

A Concluding Prospectus on Change and Development for Native Education

David Beaulieu

Proposals for change and reform in Native education have, for the most part, focused on specific programmatic approaches and options. Less attention has been paid to the process and mechanism of change. This paper describes useful strategies that incorporate processes and mechanisms.

Native education grant programs within state public school districts and Native-operated and controlled schools have demonstrated success with Native students. Yet, despite the creativity and innovation of their approaches, these programs have had little influence on the core instructional practices in most state public schools. If traditional accreditation reviews of public schools focused on evaluation of instructional programs, policies and procedures, student support services, and teaching resources *in relation to the needs of Native learners and their communities*, most public schools would not be accredited.

If we are to reform public education to meet the needs of Native learners, we must align all school system resources and programs rather than depending solely on special grant programs and Native-operated alternative schools. Public schools must assess the actual needs of Native students and organize the entire school program to meet these needs. Native education must become a vehicle for initiating change.

The following strategies would enable and require school districts to respond comprehensively to the needs of Native learners.

- Increase parent and community involvement to include input on all aspects of school district programs, policies, and procedures.

- Require states and school districts to develop comprehensive plans for the education of Native students in order to receive federal funding.

- Require or enable the development of tribal government/ state government education agreements.

- Develop model regional Native Resource Centers within tribal schools to enable tribal schools to cooperate with public schools in the improvement of Native education.

- Encourage the development of Native standards and criteria for the public education of Native citizens within all types of schools.

- Make state revenue available to tribal schools without affecting the nature and character of tribal control of these schools.

- Make Impact Aid available to equalize other federal sources of per-pupil aid in tribal schools and to enhance the ability of tribal schools to use these funds for students who transfer.

- Develop publicly funded Native schools in urban areas.

- Strengthen the unique status of Native education within the overall concern for the education of minorities in the United States.

Continued change and development in Native education will require a broad perspective. All resources must be incorporated into a systematic regional approach to the education of Native students. The challenge is to put the pieces together in such a way that maintains diversity, enables improvement and development within schools, and allows for creativity and innovation.

—Summary by Barbara Merrill

About the Authors of The Commissioned Papers

Information about each author appears separately, organized alphabetically by surname.

David L. Beaulieu, a member of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, currently serves as the commissioner of human rights for the state of Minnesota. Previously, Dr. Beaulieu was manager of Indian education at the Minnesota Department of Education. He holds a B.A. in history and anthropology, as well as an M.A. and Ph.D. in education administration, from the University of Minnesota. In 1974-75 he held a postdoctoral fellowship from the Newberry Library, Center for the History of the American Indian.

Paul Berg is an assistant professor of education at the University of Alaska, Southeast, where he teaches courses in multicultural education and conducts rural education practica for preservice teachers. Dr. Berg is also the technology coordinator for Juneau School District. He has written extensively about and produced videos on the use of computers in schools. He has ten years of teaching experience in American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

William Brescia, Jr., received his M.S. in curriculum and instruction from the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1973. He has spent much of his professional life designing and producing educational materials for and about American Indians. Mr. Brescia now serves as development officer for research at Indiana University, where his work focuses on American Indian studies and museum collections. Previously, he held positions with the United Indians of All Nations Foundation and the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians.

Gerald L. ("Jerry") Brown (Salish-Kootenai-Sioux) is an education specialist with Interface Network, Inc., in Beaverton, Oregon. His

work in reading and language arts of American Indian and Alaska Natives began during his employment in the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Torreon Boarding School in New Mexico in the early 1960s. Since that time he has developed numerous materials and training sessions to help Native students bridge the gap between academic language and their home languages.

Robin A. Butterfield (Winnebago/Chippewa) is currently working as an education specialist for the IEA Indian Technical Assistance Center III at Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington. Ms. Butterfield formerly served as the Indian education/civil rights specialist for the Oregon Department of Education. The developer of workshops and multicultural materials, she has almost 20 years of experience in education—including classroom teaching in both reservation and urban communities.

G. Mike Charleston, Ph.D., a member of the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, served as the project director for the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force. He is associate professor and chair of the Educational Administration, Supervision, and Curriculum Program at the University of Colorado at Denver. Dr. Charleston also serves on the advisory baord of the Center for Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University. In 1988 he edited the final report of the Canadian national review of First Nations education and authored the First Nations education policy document adopted by the Assembly of First Nations. He has done extensive work in Indian education and in Indian health, including service with the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians.

Karen Harvey is a faculty member at the University of Colorado at Denver. Dr. Harvey has worked in the area of multicultural education, as director of staff development for the Cherry Creek Schools in Denver and as a consultant. She was the major author of the book, *Teaching About Native Americans*, published by the National Council for the Social Studies.

John Hatch is the education director for the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians. His experience includes serving as the project director for the Sault Ste. Marie Adult Education Program, providing training and technical assistance to Indian Education Act grantees in the IEA Indian Technical Center I region, and working as a reporter for a newspaper.

Walter Hillabrant, Ph.D., (Citizen Band Potawatomi Tribe) is a psychologist working for Support Services, Inc., a consulting firm specializing in the areas of health, education, and information systems management.

Schuyler Houser is director of the Case Program, and assistant professor of public administration at Saskatchewan Indian Federated College at the University of Regina, Saskatchewan. He served for three years on the executive committee of the board of directors of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium and has held top administrative posts at several colleges in the U.S. and Canada.

Marilyn J. Johnson, Ph.D., a member of the Acoma tribe, currently works as an education specialist for the Branch of Exceptional Education in the BIA's Office of Indian Education Programs. Formerly, she directed the American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff. She earned her doctorate in special education at Arizona State University. Dr. Johnson is also the parent of an exceptional child.

Kirke Kickingbird, a Kiowa attorney, directs the Native American Legal Resource Center, School of Law, Oklahoma University, where he is an assistant professor. He has served as the acting regional officer of the Rocky Mountain Office of the Legal Services Corporation, and he cofounded and directed the Institute for the Development of Indian Law. He has also served as General Counsel to the U. S. Congress's American Indian Policy Review Commission, and he served on the executive staff of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Office of Congressional Relations.

Richard Nichols (Santa Clara Tewa Pueblo of New Mexico) is vice president of ORBIS Associates, an Indian-controlled and -managed educational research and management consulting organization based in Washington, DC. He has been an evaluation specialist at the IEA Indian Technical Assistance Center I and was director of accreditation and director of institutional planning and evaluation for the American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

Grayson Noley, Ph.D., (Choctaw Tribe of Oklahoma) is an associate professor at Arizona State University. At The Pennsylvania State University, Dr. Noley served as director of the American Indian

Education Policy Center and director of the American Indian Leadership Program. He also served as director of education for the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma.

Jason Ohler is director of the Educational Technology Program at the University of Alaska, Southeast, where he teaches courses on the use of distance delivery instruction. He is also a distance education consultant and the editor of *Online Journal of Distance Education and Communication*.

Alice (Narcho) Paul, Ed.D., (Tohono O'odham Tribe of Arizona) is an associate professor in the College of Education, Division of Teaching and Teacher Education, at the University of Arizona. She also directs the Tucson Early Education Model, a model sponsor of the national Follow Through program. She has spent over 30 years working in the field of early childhood education.

Floy C. Pepper, Ph.D., (Creek) is cochairman of the Multicultural/Multiethnic Education Task Force and the Indian Curriculum Committee for Portland Public Schools, Portland, Oregon. She has been an educator for over 50 years—as a teacher in BIA schools and public schools, counselor, administrator of special education, college professor, speaker, workshop presenter, and writer.

Vera Preston teaches mathematics at Austin Community College in Austin, Texas. She develops culturally relevant mathematics materials for American Indians and Alaska Natives. She developed and taught the mathematics curriculum for the American Indian and Alaska Native Math Camp at the Colorado School of Mines and has presented her work at regional and annual meetings of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Jon Reyhner, Ph.D., is associate professor of curriculum and instruction and Native American studies at Eastern Montana College, where he teaches courses in the Indian Bilingual Teacher Training Program. He has a rich background in teaching and administration in tribally controlled and public schools on seven different reservations. He has written and edited extensively on the topic of American Indian education for professional journals, associations, and book publishers.

Mike Romano is a writer and researcher whose interests range among demography, health, education, and science. A writer of educational software, he is currently active in environmental studies and law.

Linda Skinner (Choctaw) currently teaches fourth-grade students in Edmond, Oklahoma. She is the former director of Indian education for the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Ms. Skinner has extensive experience as a classroom teacher, curriculum specialist, and teacher trainer in both the United States and Canada. She is the recipient of many prestigious awards for her work as a writer, educator, innovator, and citizen. In 1990 she addressed the Oklahoma Tribal Leaders Summit, an historic gathering of Indian nations that had not occurred since the 1840s.

David Stang, Ph.D., is a psychologist and writer. Dr. Stang has authored eight books, 35 papers, and over 160 articles on computer-related topics. He is currently most active in the area of computer security.

Margaret Connell Szasz is associate professor of history and regents lecturer at the University of New Mexico. She teaches courses on American Indian and Alaska Native history. She is the author of two volumes on the history of Native education in the United States: *Education and the American Indian, The Road to Self-Determination Since 1928* and *Indian Education in the American Colonies, 1607-1783*.

Stuart Tonemah is a member of the Kiowa and Comanche Tribes of Oklahoma. He is currently president of American Indian Research and Development, Inc., a private nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the educational services and programming to American Indians and Alaska Natives. He has worked for more than 30 years at all levels in Indian education. His current involvement is in Indian gifted education. He also directs a graduate project to prepare teachers to serve gifted Indian students.

Bobby Wright (Chippewa-Cree Tribe of Montana) was, before his untimely death in 1991, a research associate and assistant professor at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. He is past director of the Rocky Boy Tribal High School and former director of the Center for Native American Studies, Montana State University.

How to Obtain Indian Nations At Risk Publications

Publications of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force include (1) the full-length commissioned papers (summarized in the present volume), (2) reports of Task Force meetings and hearings, and (3) the final report of the Task Force. All will eventually be included in the computerized ERIC database. Processing for the database, however, was just beginning as the present work went to the printer.

Even though these materials are being given "priority status" for ERIC database processing, most will probably not be available through ERIC until spring 1992. Until that time, therefore, the Task Force itself is perhaps the best source. This situation is explained in more detail below.

Full-Length Papers from the Task Force

At press time, the individual commissioned papers of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force (summarized in this volume) were being readied for publication by Task Force staff. The Task Force plans to have them available, however, by the time you read this. Contact the Task Force at:

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202

Full-Length Papers from ERIC

As soon as the full-length commissioned papers are available in final form, the Task Force will forward them to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (ERIC/CRESS) for processing into the ERIC database. **By the spring of 1992**, the commissioned papers should, therefore, also be available on microfiche or in paper copies from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). The address follows:

ERIC/EDRS
7420 Fullerton Road, Suite 110
Springfield, VA 22153-2852
1/800/443-3742

There is one "catch." To order the commissioned papers from EDRS, you will need to know the ERIC document number assigned to each. These numbers are assigned during processing and, so, cannot be provided at this time.

There is, however, a solution. Once the ERIC document numbers *are* assigned, you can get them by searching the ERIC database. To conduct such a search, (1) consult your local college of education library OR (2) write or call ERIC/CRESS (toll-free). If you call ERIC/CRESS, please ask for "User Services." We can help.

ERIC/CRESS provides free searches of the ERIC database for this—or any other purpose—to anyone who calls or writes. Here is the contact information:

ERIC/CRESS
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325
1/800/624-9120 (outside of West Virginia)
1/800/344-6646 (in West Virginia)
347-0465 (in Charleston calling area)

Other Documents from the Task Force

Other Indian Nations At Risk Task Force documents available from ERIC/EDRS on the same basis as the full-length papers include the following:

1. Proceedings of the 18 Indian Nations At Risk/National Advisory Council on Indian Education Issues Sessions, conducted during the October 1990 annual conference of the National Indian Education Association, held in San Diego, CA.

2. Notes and summaries from the seven Regional Hearings, as well as an overall summary of the hearings. Hearings were held from July to October 1990 in Juneau, AK; Billings, MT; Seattle, WA; Phoenix, AZ; Oklahoma City, OK; St. Paul , MN; and Cherokee, NC.

3. Notes of the 5 Business Meetings of the Task Force. Meetings were held in Washington, DC (May 1990); Juneau, AK (July 1990); San Diego, CA (October 1990); Palo Alto, CA (February 1991); and Washington, DC (June 1991).

4. Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, (1991). *Indian Nations At Risk: An Educational Strategy for Action.* (Final Report of the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.